FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 134 *13 July 1982*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Ustinov Discusses Disarmament Situation AA 1
[PRAVDA 12 Jul]
U.S. Invents 'Destabilizing System' Rationale AA 10
[Grigoriyev]
SELSKAYA ZHIZN Views U.S. Disarmament Stance AA 11
[Shishkin, 10 Jul]
U.S. Hampers Efforts To Ban Chemical Warfare AA 13
[MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN Jul]
Washington's Bellicosity Frightens Americans AA 14
[Vasilyev in PRAVDA 5 Jul]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'International Situation' Program on Haig, FRG CC 1
[Kachanov, Anichkin, Semenov]
Haig Resignation Assessed CC 1
Possible Causes CC 1
U.S. Foreign Policy 'Muddle' CC 3
Policy Shift Ahead? CC 3
FRG Political Situation CC 4
Domestic, Foreign Response to Pipeline Sanctions CC 5
Romanov Attends Meeting [Frolov] CC 5
Compressor Unit Built CC 5
Pipe-Laying Continues CC 6
W. European Opposition CC 6
Tikhonov Sends Greetings to Dairy Congress CC 6
Marchuk Meets With Atomic Energy Official CC 7
Socialism Seen as 'Valid for Every Country' CC 7
Further Criticism of U.S. Stand on Sea Law CC 9

UNITED STATES & CANADA

U.S. Administration Boosts Psychological Warfare A 1
[Kornilov]
'Turbulent, Alarming' Week Points Up U.S. Policy A 2
[Pastukhov in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 3 Jul]
PRAVDA Cites Case of U.S. Agent Orange Victim A 4
[Zhuravskiy 20 Jun]

CHINA

Chukseyev on Taiwan's 'Spying' on Students B 1
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 17 Jun]

SOUTH ASIA

India's Rao, Ogarkov Visit Training School D 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Jun]
Rao Departure Reported [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Jul] D 1
Indira Gandhi NEWSWEEK Interview Cited D 1
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Reviews Novel on Afghanistan D 1
[Verstakov, 1 Jul]
Analyst on Mauritius Claim to Diego Garcia D 3
[Kulik]

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

U.S. Seeks NATO-Style Bloc With ANZUS, Japan E 1
[Sychev in IZVESTIYA 5 Jul]
Kuznetsov Receives Lao Ambassador's Credentials E 1

EASTERN EUROPE

Grishin Sees Off Sofia BCP Delegation F 1
[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Jun]
Supreme Soviet Honors Hungarian Ambassador F 1
GDR Minister Received by USSR Deputy Premiers F 1
[PRAVDA 2 Jul]

WESTERN EUROPE

M. Ponomarev on Latest UK Defense Plan G 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Jul]
Ivanov on Prospects for Nordic Nuclear-Free Zone G 3
[IZVESTIYA 6 Jul]
Army General Varennikov Arrives in Finland G 5
U.S. Assistant Defense Secretary in Scandinavia G 6
[Kostikov in PRAVDA 2 Jul]
Brezhnev Cables Mitterrand on National Day G 6
U.S. Military Involvement in Turkey Discussed G 6
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Jul]
Report on USSR-FRG Banking Commission Talks G 7

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Reaction to Weinberger's Remarks on Lebanon H 1
Kornilov Comments H 1
Ponomarev Analysis H 1
Vasilyev: 'Situation Remains Critical' H 2
U.S., Israeli Role in Lebanon Condemned H 3
U.S. Hypocrisy [Kiselev] H 3
'Ultimate Solution' [Knyazev] H 3
'Mass Extermination' H 4
Performance of Soviet Weapons Defended H 5
Sheftunov Commentary H 5
Arab Parties Issue Statement on Lebanon H 6
Nationwide Protests Against Israeli Aggression H 8
Solidarity With Palestinians H 8
Medical Aid, Supplies To Be Sent to Beirut H 9
[PRAVDA 3 Jul]
UN Delegate Comments on Iran-Iraq Conflict H 9
[Menkes]
Joint Irrigation Projects With Iran Expanding H 9

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Attacks Western Policy in Namibia J 1
[Yu. Kirpichnikov, 3 Jul]
S. African 'Atrocities' in Namibia Reported J 2
Somali Leaders Turn Away From Socialist Camp J 3
[Georgiy Tanov]

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Green Beret Involvement in El Salvador Cited K 1
Guyana Leader Decries 'Imperialist Interference' K 1
[Kanishchev]
'U.S.-Backed' C. American Organization Condemned K 2
[Levchenko]
U.S. Plans for Anti-Cuba Propaganda Criticized K 2
[Gatselyuk in IZVESTIYA 4 Jul]
Crisis Seen in Rio de Janeiro Pact, OAS K 3
[Selivanov]

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Agricultural Developments for 10-12 Jul Reported T 1
RSFSR Kolkhoz Council Debates Food Program T 2
[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 2 Jul]
Briefs: Bukhara Agricultural Production T 2

USTINOV DISCUSSES DISARMAMENT SITUATION

LD121126 Moscow TASS in English 1110 GMT 12 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow July 12 TASS -- Follows the full text of the article by member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Defence Minister Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Ustinov, "For Averting the Threat of Nuclear War", which was published in the newspaper PRAVDA today:

The second special session on disarmament of the U.N. General Assembly, which has just closed, was working against the background of a sharp aggravation of the international situation. The aggressive imperialist circles with the USA at their head continue building up the arms race, fomenting dangerous crises and armed conflicts in various parts of the world, are irresponsibly threatening the use of nuclear weapons.

In his message to the special session General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Comrade Leonid Brezhnev called upon all governments of the world for prudence and responsibility. "We are convinced," says the message, "that no differences between states or groups of states, no distinctions between the social systems, way of life or ideology, no momentary interests can obstruct the fundamental need, that is common to all peoples, to save peace and prevent nuclear war."

In demonstrating its dedication to peace, good will and high responsibility for the destinies of the peoples, the Soviet Union has made an unprecedented step. It has unilaterally committed itself not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. This commitment, which became effective at the time Leonid Brezhnev's message was made public from the rostrum of the U.N. General Assembly, is a history-making landmark in the struggle for the prevention of nuclear war, for outlawing nuclear weapons, ending the production and gradually reducing their stocks down to their complete liquidation, for nuclear disarmament.

Why is it necessary to pose the question precisely this way? What is the military implication of the USSR's commitment not to be first to use nuclear weapons?

1.

As the Soviet leadership has repeatedly pointed out, our military doctrine is of a purely defensive nature. The character of the Soviet Armed Forces, the principles of their construction, the strategy and tactics of their use have been and are built from the premise of repelling aggression and threats stemming from imperialism to us and our friends.

The general defensive orientation of the Soviet doctrine has found and continues to find its expression also in the military-technological policy of our state. The USSR did not initiate the creation of the most destructive means of warfare that are particularly dangerous to people, to every living thing on earth. On the contrary, we strove and continue striving for preventing a toughening of the means of warfare, for preventing the spreading of the arms race to ever new fields.

This was the case with nuclear and many other types of weapons of mass destruction. Before starting their practical development, the Soviet Union tried to achieve a full and comprehensive ban on the use of atomic energy for military purposes. No constructive decision has been found. The USA blocked its adoption at the U.N. Nuclear rivalries between states have become a fact. The USA started the construction of nuclear-powered submarines, intercontinental bombers, nuclear-powered aircraft carriers, the equipment of missiles with multiple warheads. Washington assumed a heavy responsibility by starting the production of neutron charges.

The USSR has done everything in its power to contain the nuclear danger as much as possible. It put forward proposals on mutual renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons, on a limitation of their production, on ending their tests, on creating nuclear-free zones, on non-use of nuclear weapons against states which do not have them and do not allow their deployment on their territory. Our country upholds the need of preventing a militarization of outer space, of restricting military activities in the Indian and other oceans.

The Soviet Union has actively worked for concluding a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, an agreement on the prevention of nuclear war. It was at the Soviet proposals that the U.N. General Assembly has adopted the most important decisions on non-use of force in international relations, on the prevention of nuclear catastrophe, on the prohibition of chemical weapons and on a number of other aspects of international security.

One cannot help asking why the will of an overwhelming majority of states for peace has not been transformed into pertinent specific agreements and joint steps by nuclear and other states? Why the resolution of some questions has been artificially protracted and of others frustrated? The initial cause is the same -- the stand of the USA and its allies, their reluctance to bring the aims and methods of their policy into line with the interests of peoples and the requirements of the epoch. It is precisely because of that that the disarmament talks were marking time in the fifties and sixties. It also explains Washington's refusal to ratify the SALT-2 treaty, its procrastination with bringing into effect the treaties on the limitation of underground nuclear weapons tests (signed way back in 1974) and on underground nuclear blasts for peaceful purposes, (signed in 1976).

The lack of real results in curbing the arms race in the late seventies and the early eighties was due to a new revision of U.S. military policy toward greater reliance on strength, and a ruder and still more varied use of strength even in peacetime. Nuclear war is transferred by the USA to the category of possible and, under certain circumstances, expedient actions and practical preparations for its [as received] are being made with a view to "gaining the upper hand," that is winning a victory. Hence special emphasis is laid on the creation of a first-strike potential, on cutting the distance from which to make such a strike and on keeping the nuclear danger, created by such a policy, as far as possible from the territory of the USA.

Thus the United States has resumed its attempts to oppose its interests to those of the entire international community, to build its security in disregard of, and at the expense of, the security of others. Such an arrogant imperial policy based, as the present American leaders themselves emphasized, on the unpredictability of Washington's actions, naturally tends to destabilize the situation. This makes the states and peoples think again and again as to how to stop the slide-down to a nuclear catastrophe and as what can be done to prevent developments from going out of control. [sentence as received]

Can the peace-loving states only limit themselves to noting the irresponsibility and provocativeness of the conduct of those from whom comes the dangers threatening mankind? No, they cannot and must not. It is not enough to note this. It is our duty to seek an easing of tension and an end to the madness of the arms race despite any obstacles raised by the imperialist forces.

In face of the challenges openly launched by Washington against the socialist countries and those who have gained freedom from colonialism, the Soviet Union's pledge not to make first use of nuclear weapons is a step of exceedingly great importance. If other nuclear powers assumed a similar clear-cut obligation this in practice would be tantamount to a ban on the use of nuclear weapons.

We have no illusions and we do not expect that the support and approval of our decision by a vast majority of states and the broadest public circles to cause all the other powers possessing nuclear weapons to follow the Soviet example tomorrow. But sooner or later it will be so because staking on military superiority has absolutely no prospects.

And it is also senseless in conditions when there are more than enough armaments to make biological life on earth impossible. It is not strength but reason, not military demonstrations but talks on an equal footing, that are the only way to conduct world affairs with a promise of success. In this sense the new Soviet initiative is a logical continuation of our principled foreign-policy course, a stage in the development of our military policy, of our defensive military doctrine, a stage that comes in the natural order of things. This decision demonstrates the Soviet Union's consistency in implementing the joint position of the Warsaw Treaty states.

Regarding the obligations assumed from the point of view of the strategy and tactics of the Soviet Armed Forces, it should be pointed out that the decision not to make first use of nuclear weapons is universal in character. As is known, formerly the Soviet Union expressed readiness not to use nuclear weapons against those states who refuse to manufacture and acquire such weapons and who do not have such weapons on their territory. Now our pledges not to be the first to use nuclear weapons refers to all states of the world without exception.

This means that in the preparation of the armed forces still more attention will now be given to the task of preventing a military conflict from growing into a nuclear one. These tasks in all their diversity are becoming an integral part of our military activities. Every specialist with any knowledge of military matters understands that this sets still stricter limits in the training of troops and staffs, in determining the composition of armaments, in organizing still tighter control so as to exclude a non-sanctioned launch of nuclear weapons, from tactical to strategic.

The moments [as received] mentioned above far from exhaust the given problem and indicate that our decision is not a verbal assurance but a concrete action that helps strengthen the material foundations of international security. I am repeating once more that it is sufficient for other nuclear powers to make a similar pledge and a big step will be made toward removing the threat of nuclear war in general. As to imperialistic politicians and propaganda men who are trying vainly to belittle the importance of the Soviet initiative, it appears in place to ask them whether it would suit them better if the Soviet Union declared, next after the USA, that it would resort to nuclear weapons at any moment and wherever this would be dictated by its interests? I think they would protest.

And how can the peoples of the socialist countries but protest when persons now holding top posts in Washington suggest to their "potential enemy" that he go to bed every night in fear that the USA may use nuclear weapons? The threats issued by the American administration, its arbitrariness, called "unpredictability", are not just words. Behind them are mountains of arms, programmes for the production of new, still more destructive armaments and directives for using them.

The USA and the NATO bloc on the whole are looking for a justification for their actions and concepts of the "balance of fear" which is allegedly the only thing that can save the world. Our aim, U.S. President R. Reagan said recently in Bonn, is to prevent any war with the help of deterrence. The more massive the deterrence the stronger the peace. Hence more weapons, and with the greatest possible striking power, are needed.

One of the "arguments" used by Washington to motivate its refusal to pledge to make first use of nuclear weapons is its reference -to so-called "Soviet superiority" in conventional armaments. [sentence as received] But these assertions are fully refuted by objective facts. The NATO bloc has an edge over the Warsaw Treaty in the overall numerical strength of the armed forces and the apparatus for controlling them, for the number of combat-ready divisions in Europe and has an approximately equal number of combat planes and armour. If one bases onself on solid facts -- and there is no other basis for an objective assessment of the correlation of forces -- one will have to admit that taking strategic nuclear armaments or medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe or the conventional armed forces of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, there exists in all cases an approximate parity between the two sides. There is no "Soviet superiority" in existence.

As to the concept of the "balance of fear," the Soviet Union has quite a different approach here. Not "a balance of fear" and not an escalation of the "deterrent force" but a peaceful cooperation of states with different social systems, the strengthening of trust between them and undeviating observance of the principle of peaceful coexistence -- such in our opinion must be the way to peace. There is no and has not been any other sensible alternative to this.

In the seventies, the USSR and the USA, the states of the East and the West made an attempt to place international security on a stronger foundation than that of the balance of fear. The principle of equality and equal security was then taken as a basis. This principle fully justified itself in the building of normal international relations and in holding a dialogue. The interim agreement on the limitation of strategic offensive armaments, the ABM treaty and the SALT-2 treaty were then concluded. There was understanding that the policy of strength should become a thing of the past because it cannot solve any of the existing problems but can only destroy everything.

All the experience of the past years and the level of military-technical development achieved since then bear out the correctness of the political conclusions made jointly during the years of detente and make still more acute the question of inadmissibility of sabre-rattling. Peace today is a universal treasure which should be guarded by all peoples, by all people on earth. As was pointed out at the 26th Congress of the CPSU, peace is the primary condition for ensuring the right of every person to life. And similarly, nuclear war is a blow to everyone, a universal catastrophe.

The Soviet Union does not stake on victory in a nuclear war. An understanding of the impossibility of gaining the upper hand in such a conflict is also an argument in favour of the refusal to make first use of nuclear weapons. Leonid Brezhnev said in his message to the special General Assembly session that should a nuclear war begin it would mean destruction of the human civilisation and perhaps the end of life on earth. There is no place for any other opinions and appraisals if one takes a realistic and responsible view of the situation and does not walk on clouds or engage in political speculation. People should look the truth in the eyes and not let the essence of what is happening to be obscured.

2.

In unfolding a new arms race, an unprecedented one in scale, and increasing military expenditures to enormous proportions, the United States asserts that the Soviet Union has allegedly lunged ahead militarily and surpassed the USA in both nuclear and conventional armaments. The American administration alleges that the period of detente was beneficial only to the socialist countries and that it brought big losses to the West. From this it is concluded that the foreign and military policy of the USA and of the entire NATO bloc should be radically revised and that such a military potential should be created as would enable Washington to decide from positions of superiority any international problem of interest to it.

President Reagan says directly that the military might of the USA has been and remains the main and almost only preliminary condition of peace. He, as a president, is ready to use this might unhesitantly. It is asserted that reliable security is impossible without a reorganization, after the American pattern, of the existing social and economic systems in the world. Under this pretext a "crusade" is declared against communism, against social progress on earth, against social revolutions which are labelled "international terrorism."

The military doctrine of the USA, as it is formulated today by the leaders of the American administration and in a secret document of the Pentagon (Directives for Building the Armed Forces of the USA) -- which, one should think, was partially made public not without some reason -- may be summed up as follows:

First: The United States should be militarily power number one in all respect. The idea of military superiority has become a fixed one. It determines the content of all actions of the American Government and the United States' demands toward its allies. What is more, superiority is invariably understood as the attainment of a capability to make a strike against the Soviet Union at a place and at a time where and when Washington finds it expedient in its reckoning that a retaliatory blow at the United States will be lesser in strength than under other conditions.

Second: To achieve superiority, programmes have been drawn up for building up the strategic armed forces, nuclear and conventional armaments and to increase the United States' and NATO's military might in general. The main efforts are concentrated on the development of the strategic offensive forces. Under the military budget for 1983 appropriations for them are to be increased by more than 40 percent. As a result the nuclear throw-weight of a single launching (flight) is to be increased fifty percent towards the end of the eighties. At the same time their accuracy and yield will also be increased.

Much attention in the United States is also given to the general-purpose forces. The armed forces in European NATO countries are also being modernized at a rapid pace. The Americans demand of their partners that they raise yearly their military spending by at least 4.5 percent, and not three.

Third: The United States is drawing other countries in different regions of the world within the orbit of its military preparations and is trying to set up new military blocs. The construction of new military bases and enlargement of the existing ones around the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community is being continued.

Contrary to the treaty on the principles governing the activities of states in the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies (1967), the Soviet-U.S. agreement on cooperation in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes (1977), which are aimed at barring the arms race from outer space, the United States has been unfolding lately an extensive programme of measures for the militarization of outer space. A special directive of the U.S. President has been issued, determining the directions of implementation of this programme. A so-called Space Command, designated for the preparation of war in outer space, is to begin functioning from September 1 this year. Arms systems for waging military actions in outer space and from outer space are being developed at an accelerating pace. Projects are being carried out for developing and deploying missile and laser weapons in outer space, including those involving the use of reusable shuttle system of which one ended recently test flights with a secret cargo on board.

Fourth: Closely linked with military measures are political and economic actions, and propaganda and special measures against socialist states are being geared to the new doctrine. Using any means, however foul, even to the detriment of its allies and itself, the United States is trying to organize a trade, credit and scientific-technical war against the socialist community. The pivotal direction of anti-Soviet propaganda by the West is the fanning up of the myth about the "Soviet military menace." People are told again and again about the "military superiority of the USSR", about "the aggressive character" of the Soviet military doctrine and shameless lies are spread about the United States' "lag", especially in strategic armaments. All this is accompanied by a stream of inventions about the socio-economic and nationalities policy of the CPSU, about the rights and freedoms in the Soviet Union, about the Soviet Union's relations with other countries.

In their totality the actions of the USA are aimed at creating prerequisites for a fight to destroy socialism as a socio-political system (this is what was put on record in the above-mentioned document of the Pentagon). It also says that the American nuclear forces must be superior and be capable of compelling the Soviet Union to agree to the speediest termination of war on terms advantageous for the USA. [sentence as received] As U.S. Defence Secretary Weinberger said, if war breaks out in any area, the USA and its allies must be ready for military operations outside it, for spreading the war to other parts of the world, where the greatest losses can be inflicted upon the enemy.

In other words, the new strategy of the so-called "direct confrontation" has not simply absorbed all the extremities of the previous militaristic precepts of the type of "brinkmanship", but has further sharpened them. In the first place as regards the following aspect. It sanctions the most barbaric methods of warfare with the use of all types of weapons of mass destruction of people (nuclear, neutron, chemical, etc.). Qualitatively new types of weapons: inter-continental ballistic missiles MX, ballistic missiles in submarines Trident-1 and Trident-2, bombers B-1B and Stealth, long-range cruise missiles, binary chemical charges, ray weapons, etc. are created specially to fit into that doctrine. These new systems of weapons, in case they are deployed, would truly become destabilizing, by increasing the danger of outbreak of war. The United States intends to build up its offensive strategic potentialities through the deployment of new U.S. missiles in Western Europe and other areas close to the USSR and its allies. According to the calculations of the Pentagon's military experts, this may increase the survivability of the USA in the event of a conflict. Actually it is the NATO allies which are at the sharp edge of the first strike doctrine of the USA. They are placed under the first retaliatory strike, to most of which it would, of course, be the last one. Washington violates the principle of equality and equal security even in relation to its allies, turning them into hostages of the Pentagon's nuclear strategy.

The imperial actions of the USA constitute a real threat to all states of the world, especially the developing countries, which are rich in raw materials or occupy an important strategic position. It is bluntly declared in the White House that they will not tolerate internal changes in those countries running counter to the American interests. They will no longer permit new Irans and Nicaraguas.

3.

In the light of the growing aggressiveness of the policy of the United States and the NATO bloc, it was no simple matter for the Soviet Union to make the unilateral commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Quite naturally, the Soviet people, our friends, progressive people of the world are asking the question whether the right moment has been chosen for such a step and whether by the unilateral commitment we are not incurring excessive danger upon our people, our homeland, the cause of socialism and progress the world over? As we have the grim historical experience, when the aggressor was going straight ahead, putting to full gear its machinery of destruction. [sentence as received] Can all this be disregarded?

And truly the above-listed peculiarities of the U.S. doctrine and its actions in the world arena are component parts of the present dangerous tensions in the world. We soberly assess both the adventurist thinking of the Pentagon and the state of combat readiness and the potentialities of the U.S. strategic offensive forces. If the aggressor is the first to use nuclear weapons, it will bring incalculable calamities to our peoples.

But the aggressor, too, should know that the advantages of the preemptive use of nuclear weapons will not ensure victory for it. In perpetrating a crime against humanity it will not gain sizable benefits. With the present-day state of the systems of detection, the combat readiness of the Soviet Union's strategic nuclear means, the USA will not be able to deal a crippling blow to the socialist countries. The aggressor will not be able to evade an all-crushing retaliatory strike. Those who are inventing an "unmistakable prescription" for waging a victorious nuclear war, and hope, figuratively speaking, to behead the enemy in a single knock-out, pronounce a sentence to their own selves. It is apt to recall once again Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's stern warning that "only those who decided to commit suicide can start a nuclear war in the hope of emerging victorious from it. Whatever might the attacker may have, whatever method of unleashing nuclear war he may choose, he will not achieve his aims. Retribution will follow inevitably."

There must be a clear realization in Washington and in the capitals of the NATO countries that by renouncing the first use of nuclear weapons the USSR also denies this to all who are hatching plans of a nuclear attack on the hope for a victory in a nuclear war.

The state of the military potentials and the military-technological potentialities of the sides are such that the imperialist forces will not succeed in ensuring for themselves military superiority either at the stage of preparing a nuclear war or at the moment when they try to start that war.

In demonstrating its peaceableness, which is not for show but in action, the Soviet state, contrary to all obstacles put up by imperialism, sets an example of prudence. It has made a responsible step towards lessening the nuclear danger hanging over mankind.

In making the unilateral commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, we will, of course, consider the fact that there are aggressive forces in the world, which are ready in the name of their narrow, selfish aims to place at stake mankind's vital interests, and with that aim unleash a nuclear adventure. Therefore our state will further build its policy and maintain its defence capacity considering how the USA behaves itself, whether it heeds the voice of reason, the aspirations and demands of the peoples, whether it follows our good example or further proceeds along the path of escalation of nuclear weapons and build up of tension.

Knowing the ways and character of the aggressive forces, the USSR will preserve high vigilance and permanent combat readiness of its armed forces at the level of the present-day requirements. Our defensive military doctrine, which is calculated solely to repel external threat, will not be of a passive character. It will, as always, be based on the unshakable foundation of the Leninist teaching of the defence of the socialist homeland. In the event of an aggression our armed forces together with the fraternal socialist armies will defend the socialist gains without any hesitation, with all determination and the use of the whole defence and economic might of our states.

At the same time this commitment objectively makes rigid demands on further enhancing the combat readiness of our armies, their technical equipment, perfection of control and communication, further morale and political education building of our servicemen. It is necessary that the influence of the factor of surprise be reduced to a minimum, so that the aggressor should not be tempted to use with impunity its nuclear weapons first. The highest combat readiness of all arms and services of the Soviet Armed Forces, the excellent combat training standards and the military mastery of every serviceman are a guarantee of our homeland's security, a reliable shield for all countries of the socialist community.

The peoples of the world have an opportunity to see for themselves that there are two lines in world politics -- those of the USSR and the USA.

The foreign policy strategy of socialism is unreservedly aimed at preserving peace and preventing war. The main efforts of the Soviet state have been concentrated on the attainment of this great goal throughout the whole history of its existence, starting from Lenin's Decree of Peace. This has been specifically embodied in the Soviet proposals on disarmament, which have been repeatedly made, in the peace programs, which were adopted by the 24th and 25th party congresses, in the Peace Program for the Eighties, which was adopted at the 26th congress of the CPSU. The Constitution of the Soviet state has proclaimed the strengthening of peace to be the official philosophy of our country and makes it incumbent on all government bodies, all Soviet citizens to strictly follow the ideas of peace.

The foreign policy strategy of imperialism, above all of U.S. imperialism, is based on hegemonistic designs. The present U.S. administration is again trying to set them going. In disorganizing and destabilizing peace, the Washington leaders would not mind laying the blame on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries for the tensions. Their statements to the effect that the USA has allegedly been an "initiator in the process of disarmament, but the Russians rejected all their proposals" are designed to deceive people with a short memory. As in actual fact it is precisely the USSR which initiated all talks on detente and disarmament.

The United States has always had an opportunity to resolve disarmament issues on a mutual basis and with due regard for the security interests of both sides. But, as a rule, time-serving considerations prevailed in Washington. The USA and the other NATO member-countries rejected the Soviet Government's proposal on concluding a peace pact of the five great powers (1949), a nonaggression pact between the NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries (1958), the proposals of the Warsaw Treaty member-states on non-use of force in international affairs (1978), on not to be the first to use against one another both nuclear and conventional weapons (1980). The USA has rejected our proposals to ban neutron and chemical weapons, the construction of new missile carrying submarines (Ohio in the USA and similar ones in the USSR). It unilaterally suspended talks on such important issues as complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons, limitation and subsequent reduction of military activity in the Indian ocean, limitation of the sale and supplies and conventional weapons, on satellite killer systems, etc.

The American administration agreed to the current talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic weapons only one year and a half after its coming to power. A no small role in that has also been played by the powerful anti-war movement in Western Europe and in the USA itself.

The lack of appropriate progress in the field of disarmament is explained chiefly by the actions of the USA. The main difficulties involved in the attainment of results at the current disarmament talks are also connected with its reluctance to agree to mutual constructive steps.

In the field of strategic arms the USSR has always favoured their considerable reduction and limitation. Now, too, the Soviet delegation at the talks has pertinent instructions to that score. But to reach an agreement it is necessary that both sides should conduct them with due regard for each other's legitimate interests, in accordance with the principle of equality and equal security, so that everything positive that was achieved earlier in the field of SALT be preserved, so that the talks should really pursue the aim of limiting and reducing strategic weapons, rather than serve as a cover for an arms build up and for upsetting the parity that has taken shape, so that all channels of the strategic arms race in any form be reliably locked. This means that the creation of new types of strategic weapons must be either prohibited or limited to a maximum possible degree by agreed parameters.

Addressing the 19th Congress of the Young Communist League Leonid Brezhnev put forward an exceptionally important proposal that from the start of the talks understanding be reached that strategic weapons of the USSR and the USA be quantitatively freezed, and their modernization be restricted to a maximum possible degree. We also suggested that while the talks are in progress the sides should not take any actions that can result in an upsetting of the stability of the strategic situation. Such a freezing, which is important in itself from the viewpoint of curbing the build up of nuclear arsenals, would considerably facilitate progress towards a radical limitation and reduction of strategic weapons.

Our country is doing everything possible for the resolution of the problem of medium-range nuclear weapons. We declared for the complete liquidating of all medium-range nuclear means targeted on objects in Europe, expressed readiness to reduce considerably, by hundreds of units, such weapons of both sides -- the USSR and NATO. To get things going, the USSR has unilaterally terminated a further deployment of medium-range missiles in the country's European part. Presently irresponsible persons in the West are spreading rumors to the effect that the Soviet Union is allegedly violating the moratorium it has announced. I will frankly say that this is a deliberate and malicious misinformation. The USSR is true to its word. Far from deploying medium-range missiles in the European part of the USSR, it is reducing them, and is not deploying additionally any medium-range missiles where the West European countries would be within their range.

The Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty member-countries are ready to sign at Vienna any time an agreement on a reduction of the levels of the armed forces and armaments of the sides in central Europe. Under the pretext of a far-fetched "discussion of figures" the Western countries have deadlocked the talks on that problem. But

this situation can no longer be considered normal. As millions-strong armies are under arms. [sentence as received] We call upon the West to join at last in drawing up a mutually-acceptable agreement on a cut in forces and arms in central Europe.

The USSR declares for talks with the USA on all key issues of curbing the arms race. We tabled our disarmament program at the second special session of the U.N. General Assembly. It generalizes the most important specific proposals of our country and reckons with the interests of other states. In taking farreaching steps towards disarmament, the socialist countries expect that the NATO countries will reciprocate by making constructive steps.

But so far we have to note that the USA and NATO adhere to their old policy on disarmament issues. The fundamentals of the American approach at the talks are: stake on ensuring military superiority, the groundless claim that the balance has been allegedly upset in the USSR's favour, and therefore the administration will press ahead for a change in favour of the USA of the balance of military forces on the global and regional scale. Such actions by Washington are visible in all directions. Thus in particular the so-called "destabilizing factor" put into circulation by the President of the USA (the factor which is allegedly at the Soviet Union's disposal, but in fact the Pentagon is wishing to have recourse to it), which pursues precisely this aim in the field of strategic nuclear weapons. [sentence as received] We hope that the American side will take a more realistic stand at the talks which have opened. Their unshakable basis is a strict observance of the principles of equality and equal security. The USSR will not deviate from that principle.

There is an impression that at the talks on medium-range nuclear weapons the USA does not intend to make constructive steps in answer to our initiatives. It does not go further than the notorious "zero option." The question is actually posed this way: It is either a unilateral disarmament of the Soviet Union, or creation of a deadlock at the talks so as to protract them for an indefinite time, accuse us of a lack of goodwill and implement the plan for a "rearmament" of NATO.

In this connection we would like to make it clear that the USSR will not agree to unilateral disarmament. If the Americans further insist on not considering within the framework of the talks its forward-based nuclear means and the nuclear means of Britain and France, this will hamper progress. The U.S. representatives should say at last what they want. Do they want a cut in nuclear weapons in Europe, or is their main aim the preservation there of their own existing grouping of nuclear means and its further build-up through the deployment of Pershing and cruise missiles?

Neither should they try to find apparently far-fetched "arguments" as regards the nuclear weapons of Britain and France. These means are a part of the NATO's military potential, they are targeted at objects in the territory of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and, as the Americans themselves say, are called upon to complement the forward-based nuclear means of the USA. We will insist that they be taken into account within the framework of these talks, and we have every ground to do so.

In short, if the USA has the wish to reach agreement on a truly substantial cut in nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union is always for it. From our side there are both the wish and specific practical deeds making it possible to put a stop to the unending build-up of ever more destructive types of weapons, to prevent a nuclear catastrophe. The USSR has made an exceptionally important step of wisdom and goodwill on the way of protecting mankind from mass destruction weapons. Now it is up to Washington.

Reports are however coming that some figures in the West are trying to present the decision of the USSR not to be the first to use nuclear weapons as a "purely propagandist gesture" as it is allegedly ineffective in view of the impossibility to control it. It must be believed that such ignorance is not an official viewpoint. If the USA administration, the governments of the other NATO member-countries intend to use declarations on peace as a cover for further pursuing the policy of arms race and nuclear confrontation, they will take upon themselves a grave responsibility for the dangerous consequences.

The Soviet Union and its allies are doing everything in their power to avert the threat of nuclear war, to put a stop to the arms race. The Soviet Peace Programme for the Eighties and the tireless efforts by the CPSU Central Committee and personally of Comrade L.I. Brezhnev are concentrated on this task. Our fresh initiative -- the unilateral commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons -- is the decision of the entire Soviet people in the name of mankind's interests.

In steadily pursuing an active peace-loving foreign policy, the CPSU and the Soviet state never forget about the really existing military threat and are taking measures to ensure both their security and that of their friends and allies. Whatever weapons and in whatever quantity the USA may acquire, Leonid Brezhnev said, "the Soviet Armed Forces will have an appropriate counter-balance to such weapons. The armed forces of the USSR are and will remain a reliable defender of the peaceful creative labour of the Soviet people, the great gains of socialism and peace. [quotation marks as received]

U.S. INVENTS 'DESTABILIZING SYSTEMS' RATIONALE

LD130430 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 12 Jul 82

[Text] American statesmen and military leaders have lately been speculating on what they call destabilizing Soviet systems and instability of the strategic systems of the Soviet Union and the United States. Why these terms appeared and what they stand for is explained by our military observer, Col Eduard Grigoriyev.

It has indeed become a fashion with certain quarters in the United States to speak of some kind of destabilizing systems and instability. The chief American negotiator at the Geneva talks, Mr Rowny, for example, said in an interview with the Philadelphia INQUIRER that destabilizing systems are Soviet land-based, intercontintal ballistic missiles. Why they cause instability, according to Mr Rowny, is because they're very accurate and very destructive.

Now the terms themselves have been coined after the Soviet Union and the United States resumed their talks on strategic arms. There has now been less talk in the United States that the Soviet Union is superior in strategic forces. At long last, a strategic parity between the two nations was recognized. Otherwise, the talks would be impossible But to justify the fast, continuing arms buildup and the overhauling of its strategic offensive forces, the United States has invented an ambigous and barely comprehensible term: destabilizing systems. It is true that the Soviet Union has more land-based missiles than the United States and they are indeed thought more accurate. But these missiles are immobile. Their deployment areas are well-known and it would not be too much of a problem to destroy them.

The United States, on the other hand, has more submarine-based missiles which are almost invulnerable. The United States also has more strategic bombers. All in all, the two nations have nearly the same number of warheads and they are on a par in strategic weapons. It's not fundamentally important that they have these weapons based differently. The term destabilizing systems can just as well be applied to American submarine-based missiles, bombers or cruise missiles. The term appears very apt to describe, for instance, the superpowerful and superaccurate MX missiles. Each such missile will have 10 warheads, 600 kilotons each. Or take the Ohio strike submarine. One such submarine is superior to 10 nuclear strike submarines armed with 160 Polaris missiles. The United States plans to build 30 Ohio submarines. It also plans to rearm its submarine fleet with Trident-2 missiles and one such missile is two plus times more powerful than the present Trident missile. If you add to this a fleet of fundamentally new bombers and thousands of sea and airbased cruise missiles, you get a very impressive picture of some 20,000 warheads. This is slightly under three times the number which, according to Mr Rowny, the United States has at present.

So something does cast a destabilizing shadow on the strategic correlation between the Soviet Union and the United States. It is these American systems. As for allegations against the Soviet Union, they are designed for badly-informed people. The Soviet Union, at the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament, officially announced it's prepared to agree that with the start of the Geneva talks, strategic nuclear systems should be frozen numerically and their modernization should be restricted to the greatest possible degree. This would effectively block all avenues for a continued arms race in all areas. The United States, however, has swept aside this constructive Soviet proposal, and in the meantime it is speculating on imaginary Soviet destabilizing systems.

SELSKAYA ZHIZN VIEWS U.S. DISARMAMENT STANCE

PM121105 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 10 Jul 82 p 5

[Political observer Gennadiy Shishkin "View of Events": "The Invincible Movement for Peace"]

[Text] Heated skirmishes have been taking place for more than a month now in the UN building on the banks of the East River in New York and elsewhere over the most urgent question of today: What must be done to halt the endless buildup of increasingly destructive types of weapons, achieve a breakthrough toward an improvement in international relations and prevent nuclear catastrophe? The second UN General Assembly special session convened to find concrete ways of resolving this problem is drawing to a close. As before, in the discussions held there many sensible, constructive things have been said and quite good resolutions have been adopted to give impetus to resolving the most important problems of curbing the arms race and ensuring disarmament.

But life has shown that it is not enough for the United Nations to say fine things and adopt resolutions full of good intentions. If all this is not to remain on paper, as has unfortunately happened more than once, concrete deeds and actions are needed. And if most of the participants in the session now go home feeling that the session was no ordinary phenomenon in international relations and that it will leave a perceptible imprint on world policy, there are very sound reasons for this.

For us, the Soviet journalists covering the session, and for many sober Western observers, it was quite obvious from the first day of the session that this time the skirmishes over questions of war and peace could not be confined to the UN General Assembly sessions hall but would go far beyond its walls.

Some days before the opening of the UN General Assembly second special session on disarmament large antiwar rallies were held in New York. Taking part were not only American supporters of peace but fighters for peace from many other countries. On the eve of the session's opening, representatives of many antiwar organizations came to the UN building to present petitions to UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar demanding an end to the arms race signed by tens of millions of participants in the antiwar movement in the most diverse corners of the globe.

This was the response of the broad people's masses to the aggressive foreign policy of the United States, which is increasingly permeated with the spirit of militarism. It was a response to the crazy "theories" and "doctrines" born amid militarist fever in the heated brains of the Pentagon strategists. Not only military officials but high-ranking members of the Reagan administration speak of a "first nuclear strike," a "limited nuclear war" and the "advantages of the neutron bomb" as if these were routine, ordinary matters. The idea that it is possible to win a nuclear war as long as you wage it a long way from the United States -- in Europe, for instance -- is presented as a virtual masterpiece of American strategy.

It is no accident that in a talk with us, Herman Kahn, director of the Hudson Institute, a well-known nuclear war "theorist," was not ashamed to repeat the inflammatory statements he has often made in the American press. "Nuclear wars," this American hawk asserted, "can be limited, and they could take on the most diverse forms and scales, and even with non-limited nuclear wars the most varied outcomes are possible, and the side which has more, better-quality arms would have a clear superiority in war."

Adopting these ghoulish theories, American officials of various ranks instill one thing in people from the newspapers, television and the platforms of various conferences and meetings: Arm, arm and arm again so that the United States becomes the top military power in the world. The imperial dream of world domination is obviously turning the head of the Reagan administration. Washington openly lays claim to the role of "world gendarme."

At the special session, this adventurist imperialist line was opposed by the Soviet Union's clear, consistent peace policy, elaborated by the 26th CPSU Congress and widely supported in the socialist and developing countries and all peace-loving states. Outside the walls of the UN General Assembly sittings, this policy has been approved and actively upheld by millions of participants in the growing antiwar movement.

The Reagan administration, frightened by the unprecedented scale and activeness of the demonstrations by peace supporters, tried to isolate the United Nations from their influence and to erect a real "iron curtain" around the special session.

On the one hand, hundreds of prominent representatives of the most authoritative, respected organizations of peace supporters, including leaders of the WPC, were refused entry visas to the United States by the State Department, so as to prevent them from conveying to the session delegates the viewpoint of the millions of participants in the antiwar movement.

On the other hand, the Reagan administration has done its utmost to intimidate the participants in the peace movement, depicting them as "Moscow's agents," setting the chauvinist press onto them and movilizing the punitive apparatus. Hundreds and thousands of American participants in the antiwar movement have been arrested -- not only in New York but in other U.S. cities, too. But the threats, administrative measures and arrests have all proved impotent. In the first week of the special session an impressive antiwar demonstration took place in New York with the participation of more than a million people.

I had never before seen the like in New York. Old and young, women and children, communists and Buddhists, believers and atheists marched in the columns of demonstrators. For all the diversity of their social positions, religious views and party affiliations, the participants in the demonstration were united by a common goal: "Freezing and reversing the arms race." This slogan, along with tens and hundreds more, emphasizes the will for peace and the readiness to fight for it. Standing among the demonstrators on Hammarskjold Plaza, Ernst (Botsvayn), one of the participants, said, pointing to the UN skyscraper: "We have come here to make sure that the people sitting there not only adopt the correct decisions this time, but act in the way that is needed to prevent nuclear incineration."

The basic tone of the general discussion and the course of work in various organs of the special session was set by the Soviet delegation's speech. The entire hall of sessions of the General Assembly fell silent in intense attention when A.A.Gromyko, head of the Soviet delegation, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, read out from the platform the message from L.I.Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, to the UN General Assembly second special session on disarmament. The entire hall broke out in tumultuous applause at the words in the message: "The USSR pledges not to be the first to use nuclear weapons."

This was the only instance of a speech from the session's platform being interrupted by applause. And only the American delegation reacted to this most important statement with ostentatious indifference.

Washington, in refusing to support the new Soviet initiative assessed in the United Nations and throughout the world as an important step toward preventing nuclear catastrophe and increasing the level of trust in relations between states, has once again exposed itself as the main culprit for sabotaging the process of arms limitation and reduction and stepping up international tension.

Even the New York TIMES was forced to admit that "the Soviet Union has gained significant political advantages by announcing that it will not be the first to use nuclear weapons, while the United States continues to state that it will use them first."

Another substantial contribution to the constructive results of the special session's work was the draft "Basic Provisions of a Convention on Banning the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Chemical Weapons and on Destroying Them," submitted by the Soviet delegation. The Soviet memorandum "Lifting the Growing Nuclear Threat and Curbing the Arms Race" was also assessed as a concrete nuclear disarmament program. The main stages in this carefully considered program include: ending the development of new nuclear weapon systems, ending the production of fissionable materials for the purposes of creating various types of nuclear weapons, ending the production of nuclear ammunition in all forms and of delivery vehicles, gradually reducing stockpiles of nuclear weapons, including delivery vehicles, completely eliminating nuclear weapons.

As at the first special session, the United States put forward no peace initiatives. In his speech, President Reagan repeated his usual attacks on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. His speech, imbued with the cold war spirit, met with the condemnation not only of most of the delegates but of many American press organs, which stressed that no previous American president had made such crude attacks on the Soviet Union. "Both in substance and in tone," the New York TIMES stressed, "the President's speech was an echo of the rhetoric of the cold war of the 1950's."

The vast majority of participants in the special session rejected the negative, destabilizing approach of the United States to the most vital problems of today. Relying on the support of the wide antiwar movement, which is growing throughout the world, they adopted resolutions which, if there is the will to secure their implementation, could give new impetus to the resolution of crucial, complex tasks in the sphere of arms limitation and reduction and disarmament.

U.S. HAMPERS EFFORTS TO BAN CHEMICAL WARFARE

LD121502 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0825 GMT 12 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow, 12 Jul (TASS) -- America's plans for chemical rearming contain a direct threat to peace, writes the magazine MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN in its July issue. It notes that Washington intends to spend around $10 billion on the large-scale production of chemical weapons. Furthermore, even today the United States disposes of enormous stockpiles of this weapon. As far back as 1981 the total weight of America's chemical ammunition stood at around 400,000 tons.

The article draws attention to the fact that it is, above all, in the so-called European theater of military action -- one of the most densely populated areas of the world -- that the strategists in Washington intend to use chemical weapons, and against the civilian population at that. And as far as this is concerned the United States has had much experience.

The magazine points out that the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have always been in the vanguard of the struggle for banning chemical weapons. Taking no heed of the opposition from the United States and a few of its NATO allies, the USSR, the other socialist countries and the majority of nonaligned states are continuing their consistent struggle for the resumption of and the successful conclusion to the Disarmament Committee's talks on the banning of chemical weapons. "And quite a lot has already been achieved in this respect along the road to drawing up an international convention. However, the efforts of those who support its speedy conclusion are constantly hampered by the Western countries' efforts to artificially slow down the talks and lead them into a dead end. And the thesis about monitoring and inspection which the Western countries' representatives put forward recently serves this particular aim. They are trying, by achieving agreement on these problems, to preempt demands for the banning of chemical weapons, for the halting of production and the destruction of stockpiles."

The article stresses that the draft which was put forward by the USSR for the consideration of the second UN General Assembly special session on disarmament, of "Basic Clauses of a Convention on the Banning of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Chemical Weapons, and Their Destruction" takes into account the wishes of other states, including the question of control, and it may secure a decisive step forward in reaching an international agreement."

WASHINGTON'S BELLICOSITY FRIGHTENS AMERICANS

PM121445 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jul 82 p 6

[Special correspondent A. Vasilyev article: "A Million 'Yeses' in Central Park"]

[Excerpts] New York-Moscow -- You talk with American public figures, journalists and scientists and you hear: The peace movement has become a mass movement. Not for nothing has such a pragmatic political leader as Edward Kennedy, along with Senator Mark Hatfield, submitted a resolution freezing the nuclear arms of the USSR and the United States. They are clearly orienting themselves toward the strengthening sentiments of broad sections of Americans. White House spokesmen meant to intimidate the Soviet Union with their bellicose, irresponsible speeches, but they frightened their own people.

I had occasion to work in Vietnam during the years of merciless American bombing raids. The name of McNamara, who was then U.S. defense secretary, was associated with the crash of missiles and bombs falling on the bitter, wounded land. Now McNamara has become a champion of ending the nuclear arms race. The preaching of war and the superarms program have boomeranged against the U.S. administration and begun to set against it those who think and reason.

The Americans' individualism is incorporated in a saying: Every man for himself, and one God for all. Can the peace champions in the United States unite? The doubts were dispelled 12 June. Almost 300 organizations of different politicals, social, religious and national hues united to hold a peace march and rally in Manhattan's Central Park against the nuclear threat and brought 1 million (1 million!) people into the streets. This is said to have been the biggest demonstration in U.S. history.

The participants in the 12 June demonstration were motivated by common sense and mistrust of their own administration's arguments in favor of the program for a buildup of nuclear and other arms, although the mass news organs ignore or distort Soviet views and peace initiatives. What a gulf there is between the sentiments of many millions and the frantic demagoguery of those who blame absolutely everything on "Soviet intrigues" in order to squeeze out hundreds of billions of dollars for increasingly monstrous and sophisticated means for the mass annihilation of people. "I'm really afraid," one speaker said in Central Park. "I am seized with terror at the thought that I could be evaporated in a nuclear tornado." The majority of Americans demand the freezing of nuclear arsenals. Does anyone really believe they are guided by the "hand of Moscow"?

This question was put to the million-strong throng from the rostrum of the Central Park rally: "If you want peace, you need the courage to struggle for it. Are you ready to struggle?" And the million breathed as one: "Yes!"

But America's awakened conscience does not exist for official Washington, which does not wish to recognize that an ever-increasing number of sensible Americans are recovering their sight. Administration spokesmen have replied contemptuously and arrogantly to the antiwar calls: The peace march will have no effect on the implementation of our missile programs.

America is split once again. The military-industrial complex, the higher echelons of the administration, the powerful mass news media, the duped man-in-the-street -- this is who represents the war camp. But the peace camp has arisen, grown and strengthened literally in 12-18 months. Its voice is becoming increasingly loud and resolute. Common sense and concern for the future of mankind demand that the peace camp gain the upper hand.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION' PROGRAM ON HAIG, FRG

LD091936 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 9 Jul 82

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program presented by Yevgeniy Kachanov, all-union radio foreign political commentator, with Oleg Nikolayevich Anichkin, international affairs journalist; and Konstantin Ivanovich Semenov, candidate of history.]

Haig Resignation Assessed

[Kachanov] Many of our listeners, including Kucherov from Riga, Vadim Vasilyev from Leningrad and Savilyev from Moscow, ask about the causes of the resignation of Haig, the United States secretary of state. His departure has given rise to numerous commentaries both in the United States and in the capitals of many countries. So far people are still looking for a more or less intelligible answer to the question of why, after all, did the secretary of state go at such an important and perhaps even critical moment in world politics. Just as many questions are being asked about what will happen next: Might there be some changes in connection with the appointment of the new secretary of state, and if so, in what direction? I put these questions to Oleg Nikolayevich Anichkin, who is taking part in our broadcast.

[Anichkin] Of course, the resignation or departure of Haig, call it what you like, has given rise to many questions. In any event, at the moment there are more questions than answers. On the general level it is without doubt a matter of American foreign policy, of how foreign policy decisions are taken, the mechanisms of that process, how the foreign policy is implemented, and so on. And when such questions are asked one would naturally like to know whether Haig's departure sheds any light on this political process in the American administration, and in particular in the field of foreign policy.

[Kachanov] So what sort of answer can you give to such a question?

Possible Causes

[Anichkin] One can say that the new information which has emerged recently makes it possible to speak fairly definitely about this. In my view it would be incorrect just to put Haig's resignation down to personal reasons, although these are of no little significance. His harsh and prickly character and the excessive ambition which he found difficult to restrain caused irritation more than once in the White House, and he was considered an outsider, almost a stranger even, in the President's Californian entourage. In the year and a half since he became secretary of state in the Reagan administration he found himself in conflict situations with the White House staff more than once, and he repeatedly declared his intention of resigning. The first time this happened, as you probably remember, was in March of last year, when he asserted that someone in the White House was, as he put it, waging a guerrilla war against him. At that time he was talking about Allen, assistant to the President for national security affairs. Then he had several clashes with Defense Secretary Weinberger about who was the spokesman for United States foreign policy.

Then, after the attempt on the President's life, he clearly exceeded his authority when he declared in front of everyone that he was in charge of everything. This gave rise to intense displeasure not only in the White House but in the Washington corridors of power as a whole. And Haig himself gave as good as he got to those who were ill-disposed toward him. He quite frequently called the White House a three-headed monster which intended to prevent him from fulfilling his responsibilities. The secretary of state was of course thinking of the President's three assistants.

[Kachanov] Oleg Nikolayevich, is it not a question of a lack of mutual understanding between the secretary of state and the White House, or is it more than that?

[Anichkin] At the beginning political observers tried to explain everything by the fact that Haig was unable to get on with those people in the administration who in one way or another were involved in formulating and implementing foreign policy. They said that Haig had no desire to cooperate with the other players in the closely knit team which Reagan wants to see around him. As a result, he found himself more and more isolated, and he could not fail to see that he was being treated as a truculent stranger in the White House.

At the beginning of our broadcast it was said that personal factors were not decisive in the White House's decision concerning the resignation of the secretary of state [as heard]. Whatever the edge and tension in personal relations within the President's entourage, the replacement of a secretary of state at a critical moment for U.S. foreign policy is, you will agree, an extraordinary event.

The time chosen for the President's decision concerning the secretary of state's resignation may, it seems to me, be a key to understanding not so much Haig's resignation but more the processes by which foreign policy decisions are taken in the Reagan administration. As we have already said, Haig more than once declared his intention to resign, only this time his request was granted. Possibly he himself did not expect this. The United States at present has on its hands, if one can put it that way, at least three crisis problems. The first is the situation in Lebanon where Israel, with U.S. support, is trying to destroy the Palestinian resistance movement. This problem goes beyond the bounds of the Near East and is causing alarm in many countries, including America's allies. The second is that the United States cannot fail to be concerned by the consequences of the Falklands crisis in which the United States came out on the side of Britain and as a result put itself into a difficult position in its relations with the majority of countries of South America, which are now reexamining their links with the United States. It is possible that here Washington is faced by a new situation which promises nothing good. And finally, the United States' relations with its West European allies. The Reagan administration's anti-Soviet course is hitting the political and economic interests of the United States' West European allies hard. Reagan's recent trip to a number of countries in Western Europe did not bring a reduction in tension to these relations. According to the former British prime minister, Heath, at the bottom of the crisis in relations between the United States and its West European allies lies Washington's approach to international relations which, as a result of the actions of the American administration, are more out of control than at any other time in the history of the Western community. Heath considers that the present U.S. administration is constantly ignoring the fundamental principles of alliance.

Haig, as is well known, had a direct bearing on all these events and on their development. He pursued the policy mapped out by the President. He had his own style and method, which did not necessarily coincide with the style and methods of the President's assistants, but they were pursuing the same policy, at the basis of which was the single aim of building up arms, achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union and rejecting detente.

[Kachanov] But Oleg Nikolayevich, when Haig's resignation was announced he made a press statement from which it follows that he did have serious disagreements with the administration. Is this not so?

[Anichkin] What he said was literally the following: Recently the government, and I quote, has been departing from the carefully charted course of consistency, clarity and steadiness of purpose. Can one draw from this phrase the conclusion that Haig had serious disagreements with the administration? It seems to me that it is not a matter of disagreements but of a difference in approaches as far as style and methods are concerned, as we have just been saying.

In this connection it is reported that Haig was giving one set of signals to Tel Aviv while Presidential Assistant Clark was giving another to Saudi Arabia. Haig called for the use of one set of methods to put pressure on the West European allies, while the President's entourage in the White House insisted on another. Here, it seems to me, there is no conflict between the conservatives and the pragmatists. Haig said more than once that he was a hard politician.

I think that the analysis by New York TIMES observer Reston is interesting. He wrote: It is possible that Haig resigned as a result of difference of opinion over policy with regard to Lebanon or over the President's decision to put an embargo on the allies' participation in the construction of the Soviet gas pipeline, which, the secretary of state considered, would only infuriate the European allies without harming the Russians. However, Reston continued, it is not important what the precise reason was, but Haig either went or was pushed out, and nothing illustrates the confusion in the pursuit of foreign policy better than the means by which this was done. The commentator goes on to add: The responsibility for this confusion, which has put us in an awkward position, rests with the President.

[Kachanov] If I am not mistaken I think this is the first major resignation in the Reagan administration.

[Anichkin] If one leaves aside the resignation at the beginning of this year by Presidential Assistant Allen, then yes, it is the first resignation. But the general opinon was that the first to go should have been Labor Secretary Donovan, who, it was convincingly proved, had compromised himself by links with the criminal Mafia. To some extent these were crises, but if one is to talk of resignations of secretaries of state, this is now the fourth person in the last 2 years to sit in the chair of the secretary of state. Remember, in the spring of 1980, when the Democrats were in power, Vance resigned in protest against the adventure of the American landing in Iran. Then there was Senator Muskie and then Haig. And now Shultz has been appointed. Moreover, I would add that in the last 1 and 1/2 years the United States, and I'm talking about Haig here, has not signed a single reasonably significant agreement or treaty.

U.S. Foreign Policy 'Muddle'

More and more is now being said and written about the muddle and confusion in American foreign policy. At the same time there is beginning to be talk about the incompetence of the President's entourage in foreign policy affairs. John Chancellor, the well-known observer of the NBC television corporation, who has seen many American politicians in his day, considers for example, and I am quoting his words, not one of the people comprising part of the President's closest entourage is a specialist in the field of foreign policy, a thinker on a global scale or a person capable of drawing up basic strategic aims.

On the other hand the weekly TIME considers that the root of the evil lies in the system of formulating American policy which is not suited to the conduct of a significant policy on major questions.

[Kachanov] Oleg Nikolayevich, many of our listeners ask: What sort of man is George Shultz, the new secretary of state, and what can be expected in American policy now?

Policy Shift Ahead?

[Anichkin] Well, let's take the new secretary of state first. True, he is yet to be confirmed in the Senate, but it seems that no surprises are expected. Shultz is 61 and a well-known man in American political, business and academic circles. In the Nixon administraton he was secretary of labor, then director of the budget office and secretary of the Treasury. He is now coming to the Reagan administration from the post of president of one of the biggest American construction corporations, Bechtel, which does big business abroad, especially in the Arab East. According to the data of one observer this corporation is fulfilling contracts in over 40 countries, and by virtue of this, as he put it, it needs its own policy, which may well become the foreign policy of the United States.

The Bechtel Corporation already has its representatives in the government. They are Defense Secretary Weinberger, Assistant Energy Secretary Kenneth Davis, and now Shultz. The firm's consultants include Helms, ex-director of the CIA.

It was therefore not without irony that Reston wrote: Reagan can relax now; he has completely handed over the question of foreign policy to his Californian pals Clark, Shultz and Weinberger. These people are not burdened by great experience in conducting foreign policy. It is even surprising, Reston writes, why the President did not simply hand the whole foreign policy over to the Bechtel Corporation from which Shultz and Weinberger came.

[Kachanov] All the same, Oleg Nikolayevich, what are the prospects, and what changes are expected?

[Anichkin] It is difficult to judge about changes, and in the final analysis it is the President who determines the policy. This policy is well known. It is a policy of confrontation with the Soviet Union, a policy of reviewing the equitable relations with our state which have come about over a long period, a policy of upsetting the military balance and strategic stability.

Haig's resignation will of course continue to give rise to serious discussion on the topic of American policy. That is inevitable. It is not difficult to suppose that critical words will be heard; and as one American observer said, the mutual reproaches will begin and everyone will start analyzing U.S. foreign policy all over again, stressing the fact that it has been left to find its own way and that there is no agreement among its leaders. And finally, to put it briefly, one can say that perhaps there will be some changes, but most likely the changes will affect the style but not the content.

[Kachanov] Thank you, Oleg Nikolayevich. Radio listener Mikhail Vladimirovich Filippov from Yaroslavl sent us the following question: At the election in West Germany the Social Democrats are getting fewer and fewer votes. Does this mean that the time is coming when people like Strauss will rule the FRG? What sort of policy can one expect from them? I am asking Konstantin Ivanovich Semenov, candidate of history, to talk about these problems.

FRG Political Situation

[Semenov] These questions are topical and interesting. The FRG is at present on the threshold of a routine check of the country's political feelings. In September Hessen land elections will be held. In this land, where such an important industrial and financial center as Frankfurt am Main is located, the Social Democrats are in power. Will they succeed in keeping power in Hessen? Will they succeed in breaking the unfavorable tendencies of losing the electors' votes? These questions are seriously worrying West German society, and first and foremost the Social Democrats themselves.

[Kachanov] Meanwhile, it is far from immaterial to any of us who will decide the fate of such a country as the FRG. We connect the Social Democrats -- the governments of Chancellor Brandt and then Chancellor Schmidt -- with the turnaround from confrontation to detente, to wholly normal relations with our country and the other socialist countries. But the Christian Democrats left a quite different memory behind.

[Semenov] Yes, many people in the FRG understand that. On 3 June the paper STERN published an article entitled: "If Kohl and Strauss Were in Power" -- the chairmen of the conservative CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union] parties who are now aspiring to power in Bonn. The article, on the basis of authentic statements by the leaders of the West German conservatives, attempted to map out their political course. In foreign policy STERN prophesies a refusal to take any sort of independent course and total subordination to the Reagan policy of strength and threats. Strauss's view of the world is in black and white. The magazine quotes his words: America is freedom; Moscow is the absence of freedom. STERN forecasts an intensification of antisocialist tendencies in Bonn's policy, harsh pressure on the German Democratic Republic.

Can such a course attract the voters? The experience of other countries shows that the population sometimes lacks sufficient political maturity, and of the two evils may well choose not the lesser but the greater.

The land elections in themselves will not decide the fate of the government in Bonn. The general election will be held in 1984 and the Social Democrats have time to prepare for them. And it must be hoped that publications like the one we have just been talking about will play a certain positive role in this sense.

DOMESTIC, FOREIGN RESPONSE TO PIPELINE SANCTIONS

Romanov Attends Meeting

LD121956 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 12 Jul 82

[Excerpts] The CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have approved the patriotic initiative of working collectives of enterprises and organizations of a number of ministries to ensure that the Urengoy-Pomaraiy-Uzhgorod main gas pipeline is put into operation on time despite the discriminatory action being undertaken by the U.S. administration. Leningrad industry is fulfilling a major order for the production of equipment for the extraction and transportation of gas. Here is a dispatch from our Leningrad correspondent, Matvey Frolov:

More than 20 enterprises in our city -- planning, design, scientific research and construction organizations -- are taking part in the creation of this equipment, and a competition for the mastery ahead of schedule of the mass production of the new generation of gas pumping units has begun among the working collectives. During the past few days I have visited a number of workers' meetings and factory shops and have talked to workers and designers, and they are all of the same opinion: The economic sanctions by the U.S. administration providing for a ban on the supply of oil and gas extraction equipment to the Soviet Union will not hamper the construction of the West Siberia-Western Europe gas pipeline. Our country will be able to create the necessary equipment at home.

The initiator of the competition was the collective of the Nevskiy Lenin works, which is due to start mass production of 25,000-kilowatt-capacity sets next year. A conference took place at the Smolnyy at which urgent tasks in completing testing of and speeding up the mass production of gas pumping equipment were examined. Taking part in the examination of the questions were Romanov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first secretary of the Leningradskaya Obkom; Aleksandrov, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; the leaders of ministries and departments of industrial enterprises and building organizations; and responsible party and administrative workers.

Compressor Unit Built

LD111440 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 11 Jul 82

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] Today the collective of the Kuybyshev pipeline construction trust put into operation a gas compressing unit constructed with the aid of Soviet-made equipment on a section of the Urengoy-Uzhgorod gas pipeline. Compared with former ones, the unit is considerably smaller in size but is twice as powerful. Progressive labor organization methods enable construction workers engaged in various specialties in the complex technological system to operate as a single unit to carry out work at a fast pace. This has made it possible to double the speed of linear welding and to increase interchangeability.

Countering the discriminatory policy of the White House with shock work, Kuybyshev construction workers are obtaining excellent results. One-fifth of the 130-kilometer section has been prepared for operation in the shortest possible time.

Pipe-Laying Continues

LD121158 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 12 Jul 82

[Text] We begin our broadcast with information from the route of the Urengoy-Pomariy-Uzhgorod export gas pipeline.

As of today, 350 km of wide-bore pipes have been delivered here by all forms of transport. Of these, 140 km have been joined in so-called steel lengths of three pipes each. Welding teams of the Severnoyye and Priobskiy trusts, using dry taiga sites, have begun the welding of pipes directly on the line, which already stretches for 12 km. At the same time, at a number of sectors the clearing of the route and the supply of pipes to places of future line work are continuing. The Siberian workers are striving to hand over their sector of this very big gas arterial pipeline by the set time. Let us remind you that the export of Soviet gas to the FRG, France and other countries of West Europe will begin in 1984, as stipulated in the contracts.

W. European Opposition

LD121434 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1910 GMT 9 Jul 82

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige has arrived in Brussels and met Etienne Davignon, vice president of the Commission for European Communities. The talks were fairly sharp in character. On the eve of the meeting Davignon strongly criticized U.S. policy in the field of international trade. According to him, it undermines the foundations of international trade exchanges. At the center of the talks is the decision of the Washington administration to increase import duties on the products of the EEC metallurgical industry by 40 percent. This is a serious blow to the economy of Western Europe. The American minister tries to justify the duty increases by the fact that the West European governments subsidize the metallurgical industry. The reason for this is that this branch has been in a state of prolonged crisis in Western Europe.

In Britain, steel consumption decreased by almost 40 percent in the last 8 years. Several steel plants have been closed in the country, and almost 60,000 workers have been dismissed. Now, as a result of the measures taken by Washington, there is the threat of further large reductions. In these conditions, the leader of the Confederation of British Metallurgical industry Workers, Sirs, proposed a mass boycott of American goods sold in Britain in response to the actions of the American administration.

A similar situation also exists in some other West European countries, yet the United States has no intention of changing its egoistic decision. The American secretary insists on Western Europe joining the discriminatory measures against the USSR. The position of West European governments in this matter is well known. They do not want to take part in the attempts of the Reagan government to unleash a trade war against the Soviet Union. And this has again been confirmed by FRG Chancellor Helmut Schmidt. Today he completed his official visit to the Netherlands -- you can see him during his talks with Dutch Prime Minister van Agt. The FRG Government, Schmidt said, is firmly determined to adhere to the agreement on the Siberia-West Europe gas pipeline. We do not intend to waive our interests, he pointed out.

TIKHONOV SENDS GREETINGS TO DAIRY CONGRESS

LD122012 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 12 Jul 82

[Text] The 21st International Diary Congress opened in Moscow today. Greetings have been addressed to it by Comrade Tikhonov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. The greeting stresses that the USSR Government attaches great importance to the development of international cooperation in issues of food production.

A USSR Food Program for the period to 1990 has been drafted and confirmed. One of its most important requirements is an integrated approach to increasing food production. The Soviet Government expresses confidence that the international dairy congress will facilitate the deepening of scientific ties and further development of international cooperation in resolving an important problem such as supplying the population with food.

The international dairy congress is being held in the Soviet Union for the first time. Taking part in it are about 2,500 scientists and specialists from more than 50 countries, and representatives of a number of international organizations. It is discussing ways to improve the quality of milk and the introduction of achievements of science and technology into production.

[Moscow TASS in English at 1009 GMT on 12 July carries an identical dispatch, but adds: Big successes in the development of dairy farming and the processing industry have been achieved in the USSR in the years of Soviet power. At present the Soviet Union leads the world in the production of milk and the milk industry has become one of the major branches of the food industry.]

MARCHUK MEETS WITH ATOMIC ENERGY OFFICIAL

LD091414 Moscow TASS in English 1347 GMT 9 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow July 9 TASS -- Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology Guriy Marchuk, received today Hans Blix, director general of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Present during the talk was Chairman of the USSR State Committee on Atomic Energy Use Petrosyants. Questions of international scientific and technological cooperation with the IAEA framework were discussed.

SOCIALISM SEEN AS 'VALID FOR EVERY COUNTRY'

LD122038 Moscow in Italian to Italy 1700 GMT 10 Jul 82

[Text] Today we will deal with the general laws that regulate the construction of socialism and its national features. Questions in this connection have been put in numerous letters from Moscow radio listeners. We have asked Soviet historian Prof (Lidya Krepitskaya) to answer all these questions.

Many peoples are today advancing along the socialist road. It is often alleged in the West that the Communist Party and Government of the USSR would like other socialist states to accept their model of socialism, but is this true?

There can be no talk of imposition since in reality models of socialism do not exist at all, replies (Lidya Krepitskaya). Socialism is born and develops without any blueprint. Life itself determines its various shapes, but the essence of socialism is a single one. It arises in this or that country following the application of the basic principles of communism, modified in some details in accordance with national peculiarities, as Vladimir Lenin has written.

It would be more accurate to talk not about models of socialism but of experiments in its construction in various countries. And here, for instance, the Soviet experience, the Czechoslovak experience, and the Bulgarian experience include some traits belonging to socialism in general and others appertaining to specific national characters.

In every socialist state manifestations of original national peculiarities, cultural and other traits are present. Each of these countries solves in its own way the problems of the socialist state, for example industrial and agricultural development, the organization of peasants in cooperatives, and so on. For the CPSU there is no doubt that all these different ways are justified, but in the talk about various models one can see the aspiration of bourgeois ideologists to distort the very essence of socialism and the fundamental traits that distinguish it from capitalism.

Furthermore the CPSU and the communist and worker parties of the socialist countries are conducting an energetic battle and are firmly convinced that the basis of socialist order, its class nature and its essence are valid for every country and for every people. And it is the basis without which socialism is impossible.

Question: Which are the general laws?

Reply: These were laid down by Lenin in his theory of the socialist revolution. In first place he put the problem of power, which in a socialist society must be in the hands of the workers, the working class, which is supported by peasants, and by the entire working people. Only this type of power is capable of nationalizing the factories and the means of transport, the banks, the land and the subsoil. In all socialist states power was taken over by the people. For instance, in the USSR approximately 70 percent of the deputies in organizations of power are workers and peasants, the other mandates being held by intellectuals, scientists, artists, representatives of public organizations [word indistinct] students and military men.

Question: Does power also come through struggle? Does this mean that on the road to socialism it is impossible to avoid shedding blood?

Reply: No, we do not consider it impossible. Lenin wrote that the conversion to socialism can occur peacefully. For instance, the first stage of the socialist revolution of 1917 -- the takeover of power by the workers -- was mainly free from bloodshed. The war started only afterwards, provoked by the counterrevolutionaries and foreign interventionists. The workers made many sacrifices to defend their power. Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Romania, which took the socialist road after the World War II, avoided armed insurrections and civil wars. Only in Cuba did the people have to fight against the Batista South American dictatorship. In short, it all depends on specific historic conditions.

Question: But is it compulsory for the construction of socialism to liquidate private property in land, factories and the other principal means of production?

Reply: Yes, socialism is founded upon the nationalization of all the principal means of production. Without establishing this form of ownership it is impossible to save millions from exploitation. This, too, is a general law. In Russia the factories, banks, means of transport, land and subsoil became the property of the entire people after the socialist revolution. This form of ownership has also affirmed itself in the other countries that entered onto the socialist road later.

The development of world socialism has confirmed the accuracy of the conclusion drawn by the communists that the people's ownership of all national property eliminates economic and social inequality. It is only on the basis of a socialist economy that the workers can be guaranteed wide democratic rights and favorable conditions for multilateral development.

Question: What can you say about production? In this field, too, are there common principles for socialism?

Reply: One of them is the development of a programed economy. Socialism and planning on a national scale are indivisible concepts. Under capitalism all that motivates businessmen is the determination to obtain maximum private profits, which leads to national interests being ignored and to anarchical development. The objective of production under socialism is to satisfy the workers' growing material and cultural requirements. This is the primary objective. The development of the people's economy on the basis of long-term planning has ensured rapid progress for the USSR. Today it produces one-fifth of the world's annual industrial output. Planning has enabled us to forget about crises, recessions, phases of stagnation and unemployment.

Question: What are the other laws of socialist construction?

Reply: In order to build socialism, the working class and the wide popular masses require political leadership, a party formed by the most consciously aware workers, armed with a revolutionary doctrine. It is only such a party, wrote Lenin, that can lead the entire people to socialism, can direct and organize the new order, and can be teacher, master and guide of all the workers. This party is capable of marching toward a precise destination using the energies and aspirations of the masses.

In the Soviet Union, this party became the CPSU. Under its direction, the people of our country carried out the socialist revolution. Under its direction it has constructed developed socialism. In the Soviet Union, unlike the capitalist states, there are neither poor people nor people that possess incredible wealth. In the Soviet Union, each citizen ensures his own well-being with his own work. Everyone has the possibility of enjoying medical assistance should he need it. Medical assistance and education, including higher education, are free and accessible to everyone in the Soviet Union. Pension funds do not exist in the Soviet Union since it is the state that pays old age pensions to the citizens. The Soviets enjoy the right to housing guaranteed by generous housing construction program, the construction of comfortable housing at the expense of the state, whose budget is supplied by contributions from socialist enterprises. Soviet citizens know neither unemployment nor inflation. Their standard of living is constantly rising.

FURTHER CRITICISM OF U.S. STAND ON SEA LAW

LD130844 Moscow TASS in English 0825 GMT 13 Jul 82

[Text] New York, July 13 TASS -- The official refusal of the U.S. administration to sign the internatinal law of the sea convention is viewed by the U.N. community as outright sabotage of this important document, called upon to regulate international cooperation in utilizing the resources of the world ocean for the good of the whole of mankind. Obviously, the U.S. views this document, proclaiming the sea bottom resources to be the common asset of all mankind, as a direct threat to the plans for their predatory and uncontrollable plunder by U.S. monopolies.

Attention is drawn here in this context to U.S. President Reagan's statement "rationalizing" his refusal to sign the convention by the fact that it does not meet the objectives pursued by the United States.

The United States has been consistently seeking to block the convention. As far back as the beginning of last year, following instructions from the White House, the U.S. delegation to the U.N. hampered the adoption of the draft convention under the pretext that it had to be thoroughly studied by the new Republican administration. Last January Washington announced that the convention did not suit the United States and demanded in the form of an ultimatum that half a dozen amendments be introduced in the draft, which would be emaciated of its essential meaning as a consequence and become downright discriminatory with regard to most of the participants in the conference. When diktat failed and the draft was put to the vote, the U.S. delegation came out against its adoption.

Washington is particularly riled by those provisions of the convention which envision practical measures in promoting effective international cooperation to develop the sea bottom resources and to use them in the interests of all countries and peoples without exception.

Neither is it happy with the establishment of control over the mining of valuable minerals in the international areas of the ocean and particularly with the equal participation of the developing countries and national liberation movements in profits from the development of sea bottom resources.

The White House's attitude to the international law of the sea convention is viewed by observers as another attempt of U.S. imperialism to put its narrow selfish interests above those of the whole of mankind and to hamper the development of mutually-beneficial international cooperation.

U.S. ADMINISTRATION BOOSTS PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE

LD121724 Moscow TASS in English 1650 GMT 12 Jul 82

["Instrument for Eroding Detente" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 12 TASS -- TASS news analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

Analysing one and a half years of the present Washington administration in office, analysts, including in the United States, unanimously note that the stay of the "Reagan team" in power spelt for America steeper economic recession, sharp cuts in vitally important social programs and worse conditions of life for millions of people. There are two sectors, however, where this "team" has literally been pouring gold: all-round militarisation of the country and -- a high-pressure "psychological warfare" against socialist states, against all forces of progress and peace. The U.S. propaganda machine called upon to cook up and fan out lies and slander across the world annually receives more than 2.5 billion dollars, and this sum keeps growing with each passing year...

It is indicative that the top officials of the U.S. Administration who advocate a new "crusade" against the world of socialism ever more actively join in whipping up "psychological warfare." It is precisely in the Washington "corridors of power" -- in the White House and the Congress, in the Pentagon and the CIA -- that malicious lies about the Soviet Union, its allies and friends, are invented while the mammoth propaganda machine of the United States and NATO catches them up and launches noisy anti-Soviet campaigns the purpose of which is to smear the peaceloving policy of the Soviet Union, the Soviet way of life and at the same time to whitewash U.S. imperialism as far as possible...

Hypocrisy liberally sprinkled with lies is one of the chief components of the foreign policy of the United States. Seized with unabashed imperial ambitions, Washington is threatening the world with the mythical "Soviet menace" and at the same time steadily steers a course toward unbridled intensification of the arms race. It is trying to establish domination over sovereign states, and blatantly interferes in their affairs. It pharisaically condemns "international terrorism," but itself overtly acts as an accomplice and patron of Israeli aggressors who have elevated banditry and terror to the level of state policy. It is stubbornly trying to picture itself as a "champion" of democracy and human rights, and at the same time is trying to install blood-thirsty pro-imperialist dictatorships wherever possible, plays patron to the most anti-popular regimes from the fascist-like junta in Chile to the criminal racist gang which has usurped power in South Africa.

In pursuit of their ungainly political objectives U.S. champions of "psychological warfare" use a variety of dirty methods and subtle tricks. The list includes large-scale campaigns of ideological subversion preplanned by the CIA and NATO special services and directed against whole countries, for example, Poland. The list also includes coarse falsehoods, like the allegations about the use of Soviet-manufactured chemical weapons "somehwere in Asia," or that the Soviet Union "violates the moratorium declared by it" and continues to deploy medium-range nuclear missiles in the European part of the country -- falsehoods designed to distract the attention of the public from dangerous plans and moves of the Pentagon. The list also includes unabashed manipulation of the so-called "independent" bourgeois press, and blatant interference in the affairs of sovereign socialist states, traditionally considered the "speciality" of the CIA-controlled subversive radio stations "Liberty" and "Free Europe" based in Munich.

Lately Washington has been particularly lavishly financing the so-called project "Truth" carried out by the International Communications Agency, the chief mouthpiece of foreign policy propaganda of the United States. One of the tasks of the project is to "counter Soviet propaganda." But who directs the activities of the International Communications Agency in implementing this project? According to the New York TIMES, the said operation is carried out by the agency in close cooperation with the Department of Defense and the CIA. Top brass from the Pentagon seized by militaristic frenzy and masters of dirty work from the CIA, the center for provocations and subversion -- these are the "sources of truth" in today's America!

'TURBULENT, ALARMING' WEEK POINTS UP U.S. POLICY

PM121403 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 3 Jul 82 p 3

[Political observer Nikolay Pastukhov "View of Events": "Crisis of American Doctrines"]

[Text] Perhaps one of the most turbulent, alarming weeks presented to mankind of Ronald Reagan's Washington administration is drawing to a close. Although the administration has kept the world in a state of constant tension since its first day in power, this week has surpassed all previous weeks for "surprises."

The situation is at fever pitch in Lebanon, where the Israeli aggressors, following Washington's scenario, are contributing one of the most ignominious chapters to the history of modern international relations. Blinded by anti-Soviet fury, the U.S. ruling team headed by President R. Reagan has embarked on open economic confrontation with its allies, trying to wreck their deal for deliveries of Soviet gas to Western Europe. The anti-Afghan and anti-Kampuchean counterrevolutions have again been activated, and interference in Poland's internal affairs has been stepped up. The invasion of El Salvador by gangs of Honduran U.S. mercenaries has been organized and together with the local fascist junta, and under the leadership of American instructors, they are perpetrating "bloodbaths" against patriots. The American flying machine Columbia has been sent beyond the bonds of the Earth's gravitational pull on a militarist mission. In this connection, the New York TIMES publishes an article headed "American Military Operations in Space Will Be Extended Under Air Force Leadership." It reports that from 1 September the Pentagon is to create a special Space Command. Finally, this week Alexander Haig leaves the U.S. ruling team, having occupied the key post of secretary of state and been the man at the helm of the country's foreign policy.

Are all these events coincidental or are they linked by a single logical line? This question is now the topic of lively discussion not only in the foreign press but at sessions of governments, parliaments, leading organs of political parties and public organizations in many countries on all continents, as well as by the broadest international circles. Out of the kaleidoscope of reports coming in from the Western mass media, it can be said quite definitely that people of good will throughout our planet are very seriously disturbed by the unpredictable steps taken by the Washington administration, which has begun an all-out campaign literally in all areas: against universal security, mutually advantageous cooperation between countries, peoples' freedom and basic right -- the right of life. Thus the answer to the question posed above is absolutely clear: This week's U.S.-inspired events are closely and logically interconnected.

Washington is playing its vilest role in Lebanon. With its support, the Tel Aviv ruling clique, which consists of war criminals and professional terrorists, is continuing to perpetrate barbaric piracy on the long-suffering territory of that Arab country. The Israeli military is making ever wider use against the civilian population of chemical weapons, including VC nerve gas, in addition to other instruments of destruction and death, which are abundantly supplied to Israel from the United States. It is characteristic that while the whole world shudders with rage and horror on observing the genocide in Lebanon, U.S. President R. Reagan is "satisfied" with the situation in that country, as a White House spokesman told correspondents the other day. At his own press conference the other day, R. Reagan, speaking of U.S. aims in Lebanon, adopted a tone suggesting he was talking about an American state and not a sovereign state of the Arab east.

In an interview for the news agency ADN, PLO leader Yasir 'Arafat stated the other day that Israel's aggressive war against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples, whose aim is to rout the PLO, is "not an Israeli but an American decision," and that the invasion of Lebanon took place within the framework of American imperialism's anti-Arab plans, which provide for the establishment of U.S. hegemony in the Near East. All the Arab peoples now realize this and are drawing the appropriate conclusions.

Washington, in an attempt to save the treacherous Camp David deal (the United States, Israel and Egypt took part in it), is now striving to harness Lebanon to that deal by any means, making that country face the muzzles of Israeli tank guns. But as life convincingly indicates, this venture has once again opened many people's eyes to the nature of American policy. Here is what the Egyptian newspapers write on this score. As the newspaper AL-AKHBAR notes, the recent American veto of a French resolution in the Security Council "proves that America is without real leadership, while the Reagan administration is the least competent American Government in the whole of the 20th century." Another Egyptian newspaper, AL-JUMHURIYAH, also sharply criticized the U.S. stance and demonstrates the shaky nature of the Camp David deal.

As for Washington's attempts to undermine East-West economic relations, this step has aroused a storm of indignation in West European capitals and even in London. The other day the leaders of the 10 EEC countries devoted a special meeting to this question at which they indicated the impermissibility of Washington's discriminatory and unilateral decision to ban West European firms from using components produced under American licenses for deliveries of equipment for the construction of the Siberia-Western Europe gas pipeline. U.S. attempts to thwart the fulfillment of the gas deal, London's FINANCIAL TIMES writes, will most likely not hinder the construction of the gas pipeline, though they could cause a crisis in transatlantic ties. In the opinion of the press, Washington's unacceptable economic policy threatens to cause a "trade war" between leading Western countries. G. Thorn, chairman of the EEC Commission, stated at a press conference on the session's results that the EEC cannot agree with Washington's approach "either in form or in content." French President F. Mitterrand described the U.S. actions as "coercive, wounding, unjust and dangerous." Thus the shortsighted U.S. policy on this question too has led to a serious deepening of contradictons between Washington and the capitals of West European countries.

But the White House has become bogged down in not only external but internal contradictions, as A. Haig's resignation indicates. Without going into the details of the most varied assessments of this event, it can be said, first, that the departure of the U.S. secretary of state is a reflection of the American administration's deep foreign policy crisis and, second, that even some Washington hawks now consider it right for them now to build their nests among the masts of the American political ship, which is continuing its dangerous course of whipping up tension, is shaken by storms of growing public protest and is running aground on the rocks of gross miscalculations and unrealistic assessments. This course consists, more specifically, of the following components: The whipping up of the unrestrained arms race; the desire at all costs to wreck the approximate parity of forces which exists in the world; active support for the Israeli aggressor and pariticipation in the infamous Falklands adventure; calls for a crusade against the socialist countries; and attempts -- which are known to be pointless -- to exert forcible economic pressure not only on those countries, but on their own allies. These are the parameters of the American foreign policy orbit, in which, incidentally, the militarized Columbia is now making its flight.

But in our world, another, life-asserting orbit exists, created by the forces of socialism and all peace-loving mankind. This is the orbit in which the UN General Assembly special session is moving. Inspired by the historic message from Soviet head of state L.I. Brezhnev, the session is elaborating concrete steps in the disarmament sphere -- steps indicated by our country's peace initiatives.

In the same orbit are the multimillion-strong peace marches in Washington and New York, London and Glasgow, Bonn and Hamburg, Paris and Marseilles, Rome and Naples, Delhi and Bombay, Tokyo and Hiroshima -- in all corners of our earth, which people want to transform, by peaceful creative labor, into a blossoming garden, and not into ruins, as is envisaged by Washington's various militarist doctrines.

And finally, the Soviet-French spaceship has made its unprecedented flight in the glorious orbit of peace and reason. Its European crew successfully conducted bold scientific experiments for the sake of man.

Despite the furious assault on the sacred cause of peace by the militarists and racists, our earth will be cleansed of the weeds, their misanthropic doctrines.

PRAVDA CITES CASE OF U.S. AGENT ORANGE VICTIM

PM091357 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 20 June publishes on page 5 under the headline "Apparition of Ghosts" a 1,200-word "pamphlet" by V. Zhuravskiy on the consequences of the alleged U.S. use of toxic substances in Vietnam. He cites the case of former U.S. serviceman Jack Stevenson, a victim of these events, who is "doomed to die" like his friend Paul (Reytershan) as a result of their involvement in the use of Agent Orange in Vietnam, and who is attempting to win compensation for his family in advance but finding that the Pentagon, which is "ultimately responsible," is "above the law."

CHUKSEYEV ON TAIWAN'S 'SPYING' ON STUDENTS

PM121307 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jun 82 p 3

[D. Chukseyev article under the rubric "Secrets of the Secret Services": "The Trail Leads to Taiwan"]

[Text] One July day last year, the silence of the student campus of the Taiwan National University was broken by gunfire. The police arrived to discover the body of (Chen Venchen), a professor from the U.S. Carnegie-Mellon University of Chinese nationality who had come from the United States to Taiwan to visit relatives. The authorities' statement on this score was consise: the professor was the victim of an accident. However, reports soon filtered into the local press attesting for all to see that (Chen) had been murdered on the orders of the Taiwan authorities for anti-government activities conducted by the professor in the United States. The source of the information by which he was judged was denunciations by Taiwanese students studying abroad.

Each year thousands of Taiwanese enter U.S. colleges and universities, often with more than just the aim of education. In addition to conventional academic tasks, many students also carry out espionage assignments, seeking out and exposing "malcontents" among their fellow students. They are given these assignments by the Taiwanese authorities. Filipinos and South Koreans are also engaged in "student espionage," but it is the Taiwanese, judging by U.S. press evidence, who are the generally recognized masters of this vile trade.

As the students themselves describe it, Taiwan's well-financed intelligence network is divided into five branches including professional Ministry of Defense and secret police spies. Very often the Taiwanese authorities recruit their agents from among military college students.

For the majority of students, espionage is increasingly a way of earning a little more to live on. But among them there are also skilled agents conducting well organized observations of fellow countrymen studying at various U.S. universities. The informants receive up to $600 per month, depending on the complexity of the task being carried out and the value of the information obtained. The usual rate for informing fluctuates from $50 to $100. Written denunciations are made in the form of a questionnaire composed according to a special document indicating the "malcontent's" political views and his attitude toward the Taiwan authorities. When the latter receive information of this sort on a student, a warning usually follows. If this method is not effective, stiffer forms of punishment are applied, ranging from secret police visits to the student's family to imprisonment. An example is provided by the case of Minnesota University graduate Rita (Yekh) who was sentenced to 14 years' imprisonment for watching PRC-produced films in the United States.

In so far as espionage is carried out in the utmost secrecy, it leaves a corresponding imprint on relations among Taiwanese students: You look first at who is who.... Thus, suspicion falls primarily on those who can afford frequent trips home, who are not short of money, who talk too much....

Official Taiwan representatives in the United States, of course, reject the accusations of intelligence activity conducted by them, although the U.S. Department of Justice and the FBI have openly declared the existence of such a network since Professor (Chen Venchen)'s death. At the same time it is well known that the U.S. administration and university administrations themselves subsidize secret agents. Thus the student spies often receive financial rewards both from U.S. and Taiwanese patrons.

INDIA'S RAO, OGARKOV VISIT TRAINING SCHOOL

PM121233 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Jun 82 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Visit to Vystrel Courses"]

[Text] On 29 June, Gen K. Rao, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and army chief of staff of the Republic of India, who is in the Soviet Union on an official visit, visited the Marshal of the Soviet Union B.M. Shaposhnikov Vystrel higher officers courses. The guest from India was accompanied by Marshal of the Soviet Union N.V. Ogarkov, chief of the Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister.

Gen K. Rao was familiarized with the educational and material facilities and the organization of the educational process. Explanations were given by Col Gen of Tank Troops D.A. Dragunskiy, chief of the courses.

Rao Departure Reported

PM121101 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Jul 82 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Visit Over"]

[Text] Gen K. Rao, chairman of the Join Chiefs of Staff and Indian Army chief of staff, who had been making an official visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of Marshal of the Soviet Union N.V. Ogarkov, chief of the Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, left Moscow for home 4 July.

Gen K. Rao was seen off at the airport by Marshal of the Soviet Union N.V. Ogarkov, Admiral of the Fleet of the Soviet Union S.G. Gorshkov, USSR deputy defense minister, Army Gen V.I. Varennikov, first deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, and other Soviet generals and officers. V.K. Ahuja, Indian ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the USSR, was among those who saw General Rao off.

INDIRA GANDHI NEWSWEEK INTERVIEW CITED

LD120826 Moscow TASS in English 0735 GMT 12 Jul 82

[Text] New York July 12 TASS -- India maintains friendly relations with the Soviet Union, said the Prime Minister of India Indira Gandhi. Speaking in a NEWSWEEK interview she stressed that it was the Soviet Union that helped India to make first steps toward independent development at a time when the West refused to do so.

The Indian leader criticised certain aspects of Washington's foreign policy. She stressed specifically that much of what the Reagan administration is doing is at variance with [word indistinct] interests. She mentioned in this connection the American shipments of modern arms, including F-16 fighter-planes, to Pakistan. At a time when India and Pakistan badly need funds for development, they have to spend them on the arms race, she said.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA REVIEWS NOVEL ON AFGHANISTAN

PM121441 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Jul 82 p 4

[Engr Maj V. Verstakov article under the rubric "Through Journal Pages": "Through Years and Destinies"]

[Text] The last page of Aleksandr Prokhanov's novel "The Tree in the Center of Kabul" [footnote: "Derevo v Tsentre Kabula," the journal OKTYABR Nos 1 and 2, 1982] bears the dates 1979-1981, undoubtedly a considerable length of time, and yet.... The processes now taking palce on Afghan soil are very complex, and they concern many of us very directly and unquestionably.

It is with interest that one reads this work, whose author gives meaning to the essence of the events that are taking place, a work in which the writer's unshakable faith in the Afghan people's happy future lives on. You might not agree with the appraisals, emphasis on and even the versions of certain events, but it is impossible not to agree with the author's faith.

Aleksandr Prokhanov's novel has many threads of plots, and sometimes they do not manage to tie themselves up or even cross, but the reader does not lose the feeling of the work's integrity. Created out of modern times and life, the novel is cemented by the times and by reality.

Tractors with the inscription "friendship" travel from the Soviet border city of Termez to Afghan settlements, and not just across mountain passes and burning deserts, but through the years and destinies of our two peoples. Afghan drivers die on the way, and the Soviet soldiers accompanying the column save what can still be saved -- this is the actual reality of Afghanistan today, but it is also a symbol of the invincible movement of human good and of the rightness of history.

The Soviet specialist Nil Timofeyevich Ladov dies during a putsch mounted by rebels in Kabul -- perhaps the fatal bullet was not aimed precisely at him, but it is no coincidence that bandits shoot at those people on Afghan soil who help the fraternal people.

The episodes which show the work of servicemen among the limited Soviet military contingent fulfilling their international duty are especially noteworthy for me, a military journalist who has visited Afghanistan. It is a pity that these episodes sometimes lack details and are fragmentary, and yet the chief thing can still be said in a few words.

...Two ranks of our soldiers were drawn up on the airfield -- those who were ending their tour of duty and flying home to the motherland and those who had set foot for the first time on Afghan soil. Prokhanov manages to notice the chief thing and finds exact, descriptive words: "The departing men seemed taller and stronger. They held themselves more at ease and more freely. There were more sergeant's stripes on the shoulders, and medals shone on many men's well-pressed dress jackets. Their faces were darker and more weatherbeaten, while the unextinguished troubled reflections of God knows what conflagrations remained in their eyes through chuckles, smiles and amicable irony toward the new recruits."

A soldier's task is not easy. It is always difficult everywhere. It is doubly and triply so in Afghanistan today. After a long journey, our servicemen who accompanied the tractor column were resting in the Jalalabad airport building. "They were sitting quietly, worn out.... Officers were standing a little way away, silently smoking. Volkov (a journalist, and the novel's chief hero -- author's note) came up. He saw a gray face with a dropping moustache, a major's stars on the shoulder, the embers of a cigarette.... "Martynov," the major saluted wearily. "How can I be of assistance?"

Fate decided how the officer could be of assistance to the journalist: Martynov would shield Volkov from bandits' bullets and save his life. And a few days later the officer and the journalist would meet again. The vehicle in which they are dashing along a desert highway will be blown up by a mine, and the injured Major Martynov will "look straight up with his blue eyes full of tears," while Volkov will fire to keep back those coming down shooting from a mountain slope....

"The Tree in the Center of Kabul" is a real, modern novel, and it pulls no punches with regard to the subject matter. It is useful and of interest to a wide readership. I believe it is of special interest to the military reader.

ANALYST ON MAURITIUS CLAIM TO DIEGO GARCIA

LD122042 Moscow TASS in English 2020 GMT 12 Jul 82

["A Legitimate Demand" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 12 TASS -- TASS news analyst Sergey Kulik writes:

The determination of the state of Mauritius to restore its sovereignty over Diego Garcia atoll which was illegally wrested from it by Britain in 1965 meets full understanding and support in the countries of the Indian Ocean. The press of coastal states praises Mauritius' intention to take the matter to the International Court of Justice.

Commenting on the adoption by the Parliament of Mauritius of a law confirming that Diego Garcia is an inseparable part of the state of Mauritius, mass media of Asian and African countries note: The actions of London, which illegally took over Diego Garcia and later gave Washington the right to use the atoll to establish a military base, are in glaring contradiction with international law.

Specifically the wresting of Diego Garcia from Mauritius is a blatant violation of the fundamental provisions of the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples which urges colonial powers to preserve territorial integrity of their possessions until they gain independence. The act of forcible eviction of indigenous inhabitants from Diego Garcia carried out by British colonial authorities with the help of CIA agents is one more flagrant violation of that declaration proclaiming the right of all peoples to decide their future. "Britain and the United States which signed this document went back on their own commitments so as to turn Diego Garcia into an unsinkable aircraft [as received]," the Mozambican newspaper NOTICIAS writes. "The atoll has become the Pentagon's main outpost in the Indian Ocean from where U.S. imperialism threatens all progressive regimes in the region."

The press of Mauritius reminds readers that the Government of Mauritius which came to power in 1968 following the proclamation of independence of the island set forth the condition: Diego Garcia should not be used for military purposes. The press notes that the wresting of Deigo Garcia from Mauritius has caused its economy huge material damage. The resettlement of the inhabitants of the atoll in Mauritius sharply increased unemployment. Mauritian ships cannot call at the port of Diego Garcia.

In response to the demand of Mauritian authorities for a return of Diego Garcia, spokesman for Britain's Foreign Office recently said with signal cynicism that the atoll would be handed back to Mauritius only when it was no longer needed for military purposes.

However, Paul Berenger, general secretary of the ruling MMM [Mauritian Militant Movement] party said that the "government of the island is determined to press for an early return of Diego Garcia."

U.S. SEEKS NATO-STYLE BLOC WITH ANZUS, JAPAN

PM121245 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Jul 82 Morning Edition p 3

[A. Sychev article under rubric "Notes Apropos" entitled: "On Washington's 'Team'"]

[Text] Maneuvers are again being held in the expanses of the Pacific Ocean. This time Japan and Australia are engaged in war games off the Japanese island of Shikoku, rehearsing a stereotyped series of tasks set by the Pentagon "brass". But this is not the sum total of the exercises' significance, or at any rate it extends beyond their declared aims.

It is significant that, thanks to Washington's efforts, bilateral ties between Tokyo and Canberra in the military sphere are becoming increasingly close. Last fall these U.S. allies held exercises off Australia. This spring they took part in the multinational Rimpac-82 exercises masterminded by the United States. Thanks to the efforts of the United States, visits by Australian warships to Japanese ports and familiarization tours by representatives of the Japan National Defense Agency to Australia have become more frequent.

As we know, under cover of the militarist slogan "To defend Western democracy," the U.S. administration is trying to consolidate its strategic military positions in the Pacific Ocean, which it has declared a "zone of vital U.S. interests." In this connection, Washington has been persistently urging its allies in the region to "share responsibility." But a mere increase in these countries' military appropriations does not fully satisfy Washington's demands.

All the signs are that the "fatherly" U.S. concern for strengthening military ties between Japan and Australia, between whom, by the way, there are no agreements on cooperation in this sphere, is designed to whip up support for the idea, which is unpopular among the region's peoples, of creating another aggressive bloc there along the lines of NATO. The basis for it is to be the existing ANZUS alliance comprising Australia, New Zealand and the United States. Within the framework of the alliance masterminded in the Pentagon the aforementioned U.S. partners, for whose ranks Japan is being groomed, are cast in the supporting role of "trace horses" ready to pull Washington's militarist "team" along the dangerous road of escalating tension in the region at the bidding of people across the Pacific Ocean.

KUZNETSOV RECEIVES LAO AMBASSADOR'S CREDENTIALS

LD121340 Moscow TASS in English 1328 GMT 12 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow July 12 TASS -- Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Lao People's Democratic Republic Khamta Duangthongla presented his credentials to alternate member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, First Vice-President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Vasiliy Kuznetsov in the Kremlin today.

When presenting his credentials, Khamta Duangthongla said that the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union were fraternal countries whose stable, deep and all-round relations were based on the principles of socialist internationalism. He stressed the resolve of his country permanently to develop and strengthen these relations.

In his speech of reply, Vasiliy Kuznetsov said that at all stages of the Lao people's struggle for freedom and independence the Soviet Union had invariably rendered its assistance and support to it. Today, too, the CPSU and the Soviet state are firmly following the course of developing close relations with the young Lao Republic.

GRISHIN SEES OFF SOFIA BCP DELEGATION

PM121145 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 82 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Visit Ended"]

[Excerpts] The visit to Moscow by the delegation of the Sofia BCP city committee led by Ch. Aleksandrov, secretary of the BCP Central Committee and first secretary of Sofia party city committee, has ended.

Yesterday the Sofia BCP city committee delegation left Moscow for home.

The delegation was seen off at Sheremetyevo Airport by V.V. Grishin, first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom, R.F. Dementyeva, secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom, and responsible workers of Moscow CPSU Gorkom.

D. Zhulev, Bulgarian ambassador in the USSR, and employees of the Bulgarian Embassy in the Soviet Union were in the sendoff party.

SUPREME SOVIET HONORS HUNGARIAN AMBASSADOR

LD092114 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 9 Jul 82

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has awarded the Order of Friendship of Peoples to Matyas Szuros, the ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Hungarian Republic to our country. This recognizes his great work in developing and strengthening friendship and all-round cooperation between the two countries.

GDR MINISTER RECEIVED BY USSR DEPUTY PREMIERS

PM120925 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 82 p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Conversations Held"]

[Text] On 1 July A.K. Antonov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received G. Kleiber, deputy chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers and minister of general engineering, agricultural machinery and vehicle building.

On the same day G. Kleiber was received by L.A. Kostandov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. There was a conversation on questions of economic, scientific and technical cooperation between the USSR and the GDR in the sphere of machine building, in which K.N. Belyak, minister of machine building for animal husbandry and fodder production, took part.

E. Winklemann, GDR ambassador in the USSR, took part in the talks.

M. PONOMAREV ON LATEST UK DEFENSE PLAN

PM121217 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Jul 82 p 3

[Col M. Ponomarev "Military-Political Review": "London: Gamble on the 'Nuclear Fist'"]

[Text] Not so long ago, the peace committee of the Finchely constituency, where Prime Minister M. Thatcher was voted into Parliament in the election, sent a message to her. It contained a request to explain why Britain's policy is increasing and not reducing the danger of war. In reply the head of government began to complain of the mythical "weakness" of NATO in the face of the "Soviet military threat." In order to curb this "threat," she explained, Britain and its partners will not shun the use of nuclear weapons.

The gamble on the "nuclear fist" and the readiness to be the first to use it represent the core of the Conservatives' military policy. This was once more confirmed by the government "White Paper on Defence, 1982-1983," just published in London. It graphically reflects the aggressive nature of the British ruling circles' foreign policy and their course toward intensifying the arms race and further aggravating East-West confrontation.

What is the essence of London's military program? Primarily the clear priority given to militarist preparations. Despite the critical state of the country's economy, mass unemployment and acute social problems, almost 5 percent of GNP is allotted to military purposes (Britain, of the leading NATO countries is second only to the United States in this respect). Appropriations for the Defense Ministry are growing steadily. In 1982-1983 they will increase by 13 percent in comparison with last year and amount to 14,534,000,000 rounds.

The second particular feature of the Conservatives' military program is the special attention paid to the modernization and further buildup of the British Armed Forces' nuclear potential. It is based, as we know, on Vulcan bomber nuclear weapon carriers and four Resolution class nuclear missile submarines. Each carries on board 16 Polaris-A3 ballistic missiles, with a range of 4,600 km. These missiles were purchased in the United States, but British nosecones, each with three 200-kiloton warheads, have been fitted to them. Thus, as the press points out, 192 nuclear warheads fitted to missiles carried on British submarines are targeted on the Soviet Union.

Since 1972 Britain has been modernizing the Polaris missile warheads. This work is being carried out within the framework of the Chevaline Project and is now near completion. The project envisages both increasing to six the number of warheads on every missile and also a number of measures aimed at overcoming enemy ABM defense. According to Britain's military-political leadership, the implementation of the Chevaline Program will considerably increase the strike power of the naval strategic forces. Just one modernized Polaris-A3 missile, equipped with the new warheads is capable of ensuring the destruction of multiple targets covering an area of over 18,000 square km (a missile with the existing warheads covers an area of 1,300 square km).

However, even this modernization no longer suits the British Conservative government. Following the path of the arms race, as the White Paper points out, it is placing special emphasis on the construction of four new, bigger and more sophisticated nuclear missile submarines designed to replace the existing fleet in the future. The key aspect in building the new submarine fleet is that it is to be equipped with U.S. Trident-2 (D-5) ballistic missiles. Each submarine will have no fewer than 12 such missiles with a range of up to 11,000 km. The Reagan administration has already agreed to sell Britain D-5 missiles, but they will be equipped with British-manufactured warheads. It is envisaged that a minimum of eight independent targeted warheads distinguished by very high accuracy will be carried by every missile. Thus, following the implementation of the Trident-2 program, the British submarine fleet will have no fewer than 384 high-yield warheads. In terms of destructive force they will be approximately three times more powerful than the present Polaris system.

London does not intend to limit itself to building a new ballistic missiles submarine fleet. The White Paper stresses that the government is fully determined to implement the decision to deploy U.S. medium-range cruise missiles [GLCM] on British territory. Even without them the country has long been a U.S. nuclear bridgehead. According to the British press, there are over 100 U.S. military bases in the British Isles. Over 340 U.S. military aircraft are deployed there, many of them nuclear weapon carriers, and B-52 strategic bombers are constantly making landings. In the Holy Loch in Scotland U.S. nuclear submarines carrying Poseidon ballistic missiles are based. Comparing Britain to an "aircraft carrier for the U.S. military machine," the DAILY EXPRESS newspaper wrote: "If we were a real aircraft carrier, we would sink under the weight of U.S. weapons and aircraft."

The Conservatives' military program envisages not only the strengthening of the British "nuclear fist." A large place in it is devoted to the buildup of conventional weapons and armed forces. In particular the earlier contemplated reduction of the British Army of the Rhine has been cancelled. This army, deployed on West German territory, will still consist of three divisions. The British Armed Forces will continue to commit outrages in Ulster. Some 11,000 servicemen are allotted to stopping the population of Northern Ireland from acting in defense of their democratic rights and freedoms.

The authors of the White Paper considered it necessary to stress Britain's readiness "to play an important role in the NATO bloc, which remains an inseparable part... of the West's policy." Thus London showed its gratitude to the North Atlantic bloc partners for the support given to Britain's aggressive actions in the South Atlantic.

Contrary to observers' expectations, the White Paper contains no direct conclusions from the lessons of the Falklands conflict. But it is perfectly obvious -- and this is clear from the debates in Parliament on defense questions -- that the lessons of the conflict are having a noticeable influence on the British military program.

These lessons are not simple. Various opinions are being expressed in the Western press. Thus, on the basis of the heavy British fleet losses (of 23 British destroyers and frigates which took part in the military operations, four were sunk and another 12 damaged), certain observers draw the conclusion that large ships are virtually impotent against modern means of naval warfare, and consequently the era of giant aircraft carriers and other large surface ships is receding into the past. Others, on the contrary, believe that only a navy with large, well-armed and equipped aircraft carriers and other ships is capable of ensuring the fulfillment of the tasks imposed on it. Contradictory opinions are also expressed on a number of other questions too.

However, regardless of their stances, all of those taking part in the debate agree that the South Atlantic was a proving ground where the most modern and sophisticated military equipment was tested and that the new, increasingly complex combat systems created on the basis of the latest achievements of science and technology have a very powerful influence on strategy and tactics.

The British military-political leadership, too, is drawing definite conclusions from the experience of the combat operations. In this connection Prime Minister M. Thatcher said in a recent television interview that, though lessons will still be drawn from the Falklands campaign, "Britain's military policy was correct" on the whole. But amendments, moreover substantial ones, are already being introduced into it.

Thus, the former proposals to reduce the surface fleet have been shelved. Several new destroyers and also submarines are being hastily built. Defense Secretary J. Nott announced the reversal of the decision to sell Australia the aircraft carrier Invincible, which with the Hermes formed the backbone of the British armada which committed acts of colonial brigandage in the South Atlantic. Moreover, the aircraft carrier Illustrious, equipped with the latest antimissile system, has been commissioned for the Royal Navy considerably ahead of schedule. Plans are being examined to replace the ships which were sunk during the combat operations.

Appropriations are being increased for those types of weapons which, in the opinion of the British command, proved their worth during the conflict. This applies to the Harrier VTOL aircraft, Tigerfish torpedoes and surface to air and surface to surface missiles. The Nimrod airborne warning and control system and other electronic systems used by the British Navy and Air Force will be modernized.

At the same time, plans for turning the Falkland Islands into a major military base in the South Atlantic are being implemented at an accelerated pace. Intending to preserve the colonial status of the archipelago, the British Government is performing a lot of runway building there now. The landing strip at Port Stanley is being lengthened. Nimrod spy planes, F-4 Phantom fighter-bombers and Harrier fighters as well as a garrison of 5,000 men will be deployed on the islands.

As a whole, London's military program expounded in the White Paper and J. Nott's speeches in Parliament leave no doubt that the Conservative government is sticking to its imperial ambitions and intends to remain Washington's closest assistant in its attempt to aggravate the international situation and achieve U.S. and NATO military superiority over the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact. This position meets with the full support and understanding of the White House. It was not for nothing that its head chose London as the platform from which to throw out his appeal to begin a "crusade" against communism. And then, during M. Thatcher's visit to Washington, President R. Reagan agreed in essence with the British premier's intention to preserve British sovereignty over the Falkland Islands.

However, in Britain itself the policy of the Conservative government, including its military policy, is meeting with increasingly acute criticism. Broad circles of the British public understand that genuine security can only come to the country not through the arms race but by curbing it, not through the "nuclear fist" but through a sober view of the genuine interests of Britain in the modern world.

IVANOV ON PROSPECTS FOR NORDIC NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE

PM121047 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Jul 82 Morning Edition p 5

[Correspondent N. Ivanov "Letter From Helsinki": "Nuclear-Free Zone -- Demand of the Times"]

[Text] Two events occurred a few days apart. In Oslo the government spoke out against holding talks on creating a nuclear-free zone at the present time. In Sandefjord the leaders of the Socialist Democratic Parties and trade union associations of North Europe demanded the formulation of a concrete plan to form a nuclear-free zone. The Norwegian Government justified its refusal by asserting that the creation of such a zone would not guarantee the country's security in the event of a nuclear confrontation. The participants in the working conference in Sandefjord declared that a nuclear-free zone would contribute to the security of not only North Europe but also the entire European Continent.

As we see, these are two different approaches to one problem. During a debate in the Storting Norwegian Foreign Minister Svenn Stray frankly declared that "Norway's participation in a nuclear-free zone is not compatible with NATO membership." This argument cannot be said to be distinguished by any great novelty.

It is known that back in 1961 O. Unden, who was then Sweden's foreign minister, proposed setting up a "club of nonnuclear states." The "Unden Plan" did not receive wide support. Some 2 years later President Urho Kekkonen of Finland advanced a new initiative. Under the conditions of the nuclear arms race, he believed, the nonnuclear states of the north must adopt a pledge -- by means of regional agreements -- not to produce nuclear weapons or deploy them on their territory. These states would be able to ensure their security, he believed, only if they state clearly and convincingly that they have dissociated themselves from nuclear weapons. Some 15 years later the former president of Finland returned once again to this proposal, elaborating on the plan to create a nuclear-free zone.

This excursion into history shows that, despite all their endeavors, the opponents of detente have failed to bury the idea of a nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe.

The dispute over it has recently transcended diplomatic talks. The "Kekkonen Plan" won millions of supporters in all the countries of the region. Foreign Minister P. Stenback said in a conversation with your correspondent that the struggle for a nuclear-free zone accords with the sentiments of the Finnish public. "It is easy for us to pursue this foreign policy line when we feel the support of the country's population," he emphasized.

Some time ago representatives of the Nordic countries' public presented M. Koivisto, president of the republic, with the appeal "for a nuclear-free north," signed by approximately 2.5 million people. Mass demonstrations in support of the proposal to create a nuclear-free zone have taken place in Denmark, Sweden and Norway. In Goteborg 50,000 representatives of the Scandinavian countries adopted an appeal demanding that American Pershings and Tomahawks be kept out of the European Continent and concrete steps be taken to create a nuclear-free zone.

Of course, pro-NATO circles in Denmark and Norway are forced to take public feeling into consideration and therefore do not openly attempt to reject Finland's initiative. They are endeavoring to postpone indefinitely the question of creating a "nuclear-free zone." "It is worth pointing out," Roald Halvorsen, chairman of the Norwegian Peace Committee, said, "that the country's population rejects the thesis of the government, which maintains that the creation of a zone free from nuclear weapons in the north of the continent is possible only within the framework of a nuclear-free Europe. This is just a maneuver designed to undermine the movement for a nuclear-free north."

Another argument of the Scandinavian Atlanticists is not noted for its novelty either. "Is it at all necessary to erect an antinuclear palisade?" -- they inquire. "For North Europe is already a zone free from nuclear weapons." Indeed, Finland has declared that it will not produce or acquire them. Sweden, too, has made an analogous decision. And as for Denmark and Norway, they have confirmed their intention not to deploy nuclear weapons on their territory in peacetime.

All this is so. But, on the other hand, the Icelanders are far from convinced that there are no nuclear weapons on the American base at Keflavik. Nor do certain reports from Oslo and Copenhagen put people in an optimistic frame of mind: even the Norwegian press does not rule out that there could be nuclear weapons on Scandinavian soil during NATO maneuvers. Particular alarm is aroused among these countries' peoples by the medium-range American missiles which it is planned to deploy in West Europe: Will their trajectory not pass over Sweden or Denmark?

In this context the problem of creating a nuclear-free zone has assumed special urgency. In his book "Before It Is Too Late, Nuclear War or Disarmament" Jens Evensen, the well-known Norwegian specialist on international law, suggested a draft agreement on a nuclear-free zone: the countries of Nordic Europe "adopt pledges to ban and prevent" inside their territories "the testing, use, production or acquisition" of nuclear weapons.

They must not obtain or store them or allow their transportation. In other words, it is a question of every country in North Europe recording its own "nonnuclear policy in international law and securing appropriate guarantees from nuclear states."

The Soviet Union, as is known, has repeatedly expressed its readiness to make such pledges. Replying to questions put by a correspondent of the Finnish newspaper SUOMEN SOSIALIDEMOKRAATTI, L.I. Brezhnev emphasized that the Soviet Union is prepared to assume a commitment not to use nuclear weapons against countries in North Europe which become parties to a nuclear-free zone, that is, which renounce the production, acquisition and deployment of nuclear weapons on their territory. But this does not rule out the possibility of also examining the question of certain other measures with regard to our own territory in the region adjacent to the nuclear-free zone in North Europe.

The creation of such a zone would be more complete for its participants if corresponding pledges were also to be adopted by the nuclear countries belonging to the North Atlantic bloc.

But precisely this point runs counter to NATO strategy, which attaches special significance to Norway, regarding it as the bloc's northern flank. The aforementioned statement in the Storting by Foreign Minister S. Stray was not a slip of the tongue: in a special message to the Norwegian Government Washington bluntly declared that the creation of a nuclear-free zone does not accord with the North Atlantic bloc's strategic interests.

It is known that K. Willoch's cabinet has done a great deal to expedite the implementation of the Atlanticists' military plans. The conclusion of the agreement with the United States on the prepositioning of heavy arms and other combat hardware on Norwegian territory in case of a "crisis" situation has in point of fact given Washington operational scope. Weapons, ammunition and diverse military equipment will soon start reaching Norway from across the ocean, so the American press maintains; naval bases and airfields are being enlarged and reconstructed, and more intensive use is being made of the Loran-C and Omega radio navigation stations, which are to backup the actions of the U.S. nuclear submarine fleet.

The Norwegian Storting recently set aside 49 million kroner for future NATO spending associated with deploying American Pershings and Tomahawks on the European Continent. Some politicians tried to show that Norway's payment is purely symbolic in nature. The newspaper FRIHETEN for example, writes that many parliamentarians were totally ignorant as to the use to which the greater part of the appropriations will be put.

But NATO generals have known about this for a long time. In full accordance with the bloc's nuclear strategy it is planned to modernize several airfields and enlarge the NATO main staff in Kolsas and the air defense staff in (Reytan). It has been decided to set up one more staff in southern Norway. It is perfectly obvious that the plans to create a nuclear-free zone in North Europe in no way tally with the North Atlantic bloc's plans. This is precisely why pro-NATO circles are trying to prevent businesslike discussion of Finland's initiative and seeking to subdue the wave of antinuclear demonstrations in their countries.

The newspaper AFTENPOSTEN, in particular, even hastened to assure its readers that the new Finnish president is by no means such an active champion of a nuclear-free zone in North Europe as his predecessor was. It was echoed almost word for word by THE FINANCIAL TIMES and the New York TIMES. To this M. Koivisto replied that the Finnish Government will do everything possible to create a zone free from nuclear weapons in North Europe.

In this situation Washington deemed it necessary to interfere openly. During his tour of Scandinavian countries U.S. Assistant Defense Secretary R. Perle did not tire of talking about the "nuclear threat from the Soviet Union." The recipe which he offered as an alternative fits into the concise formula: "Arm." But this is what is significant: fewer and fewer people wish to live by Washington's recipes.

The Soviet Union's stand on the question of creating nuclear-free zones is well known. We advocate such zones. The USSR's principled approach to problems of banning nuclear weapons is well-known too. The new Soviet initiative set forth in the message of L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the UN General Assembly second special session on disarmament expresses clearly and unambiguously the Soviet Union's pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. This firm word of our country serves for millions of people as a very weighty argument in the debate on whether or not there is to be a nuclear-free zone in North Europe.

ARMY GENERAL VARENNIKOV ARRIVES IN FINLAND

LD121700 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1345 GMT 12 Jul 82

[Text] Helsinki, 12 Jul (TASS) -- At the invitation of the chief of the General Staff of the defense forces of Finland, Army General V.I. Varennikov, first deputy chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces arrived here today on an official visit. V.I. Varennikov was met at Helsinki railway station by Lieutenant General E. Kanninen, chief of General Staff of the armed forces of Finland.

U.S. ASSISTANT DEFENSE SECRETARY IN SCANDINAVIA

PM121215 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 82 p 5

[Correspondent M. Kostikov dispatch: "False Cloak"]

[Text] Helsinki, 1 Jul -- Discussion of the most important foreign policy and military questions -- such was the official goal of the week-long tour of the countries of North Europe by R. Perle, U.S. assistant defense secretary, and of his talks with politicians and business representatives of Sweden, Finland, Denmark and Norway.

In the capitals of the United States' Scandinavian NATO partners -- Oslo and Copenhagen -- the Pentagon emissary called for a further buildup of war preparations within the framework of the notorious Atlantic solidarity. The transatlantic visitor said that the United States was not very pleased with certain of its NATO pertners, including Denmark -- which, as is known, is not enthusiastic about the Pentagon's demands for an annual increase in military appropriations.

Perle met with the greatest understanding for the aims of U.S. policy in Oslo. After discussing the question of stockpiling U.S. heavy weapons on Norwegian soil, he expressed the idea that the Norwegians might offer their gas to West Europe and thereby help to foil the building of the West Siberia-West Europe gas pipeline.

BREZHNEV CABLES MITTERRAND ON NATIONAL DAY

LD131050 Moscow TASS in English 1037 GMT 13 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow July 13 TASS -- Leonid Brezhnev has sent a telegram to the President of the French Republic Francois Mitterrand, which reads:

"On the national holiday of France, I send my congratulations and best wishes to you, Mr. President, and the friendly French people. The cooperation between the Soviet Union and France in various spheres whose recent striking manifestation has been the joint harmonious work of Soviet and French cosmonauts, benefits, as shown by many years of experience, the peoples of both countries, the interests of peace and security in Europe and beyond its boundaries. We in the Soviet Union, as before, are open to good relations with France and its people."

U.S. MILITARY INVOLVEMENT IN TURKEY DISCUSSED

LD130820 Moscow TASS in English 0700 GMT 13 Jul 82

["Pleasing Washington" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 13 TASS -- "Everyone knows that certain rightwing publications in Turkey make a sizeable contribution to befuddling the public with anti-Soviet misinformation of the lowest sort," KRASNAYA ZVEZDA writes in its comment on another anti-Soviet concoction of the Turkish newspaper TERCUMAN. The author of the concoction, a Rauf Tamer, claims that there is a special school on Soviet territory, in Odessa, training "budding terrorists from different countries." Upon the completion of the training course they are presumably "sent to places where blood is being spilt," and supplied with weaponry and "certificates," in particular, in Arabic.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA writes that this slander "is needed by Washington, particularly now that the Israeli aggressors with its complicity have expanded criminal terror against the Palestinian Arabs and local population in Lebanon to the proportions of appalling genocide."

The newspaper points out that the anti-Soviet falsehood cooked up by Rauf Tamer pursues one more important objective, that of onvoking a threadbare "Soviet threat" bogey in order to distract Turkish public attention from the adverse consequences of Washington's attempts to involve the country into the Pentagon's adventuristic strategy. "It is common knowledge that U.S. military bases will be expanded and modernized under a Turkish-American agreement signed this year and that they will accommodate AWACS planes which will carry out spy missions not only against the Soviet Union."

"Washington is also camouflaging with 'Soviet threat' concoctions its attempts to secure the stationing of the U.S. interventionist Rapid Deployment Force on U.S. bases in Turkey, directing them against Arab and other Moslem countries," the commentary stresses.

"Regrettably, there are those in Turkey who are prepared to sacrifice the country's national interests to rabid anti-Sovietism provoked from across the ocean," KRASNAYA ZVEZDA concludes.

REPORT ON USSR-FRG BANKING COMMISSION TALKS

LD121430 Moscow TASS in English 1415 GMT 12 Jul 82

[Text] Leningrad July 12 TASS -- Continuing here is the second meeting of the expert group on banking and financial questions of the Commission of the USSR and the FRG on Economic and Scientific-Technical Cooperation. The results of the work done in the 18 months since the first meeting of the group have been summed up. The sides exchanged views on questions of developing inter-bank relations and the cooperation of the credit and financial establishments of the two countries.

Considering the wishes of the West German side and attaching much importance to questions connected with the development of the energy complex in Western Siberia, a report was made at the meeting on the development of the Soviet economy in the current five-year-plan period and on key problems of Siberia's development.

Inter-bank documents are to be signed tomorrow. During the meeting the chairman of the board of Vneshtorgbank of the USSR Yuriy Ivanov stressed: "We proceed from the assumption that the sides intend to strictly adhere to their assumed obligations both as regards the agreement and the commercial contracts. In conditions of the aggravation of the political situation in the world the factor of reliability manifests itself particularly vividly and we would like to believe that our relations, which already have a long history and rich experience, will withstand this test by time."

The speaker of the board of "Deutsche Bank" Dr. Wilhelm Christians stressed that the business cooperation of the two countries rests on a long-term basis. Having declared against the Reagan administration's discriminatory policy in respect of the USSR, he assured that the West German banks will be reliable partners in bilateral relations between the FRG and the USSR.

REACTION TO WEINBERGER'S REMARKS ON LEBANON

Kornilov Comments

LD121814 Moscow TASS in English 1741 GMT 12 Jul 82

["Weinberger Lets Himself Go" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 12 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

The more details the public learns about the Washington plan to introduce American troops into Lebanon, the more evident it is that the plan seeks to add American occupation to that by Israel. This was indicated again by an interview of U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger with the American NBC television network. Unlike some Washington officials, who still try to cover up the invasion plans with hypocritical talk about their alleged desire for a "settlement," the chief of the Pentagon has thrown off all restraint. It looks as if the Lebanese Government were, in the view of Washington, only the "theoretical" master of Beirut and unable to control the country -- and this is why Weinberger is ready to send, at the "appropriate" moment, cross-country vehicles with U.S. Marines to Beirut, along the tracks made by Israeli tanks.

One cannot help wondering when one reads this reckless statement: Has Washington completely forgotten about the existence of such generally accepted concepts of international law as sovereignty, independence, inviolability of other countries' borders? It does look like it. When he talks about Lebanese affairs, it looks as if Mr Weinberger speaks about some American state -- with the only difference, perhaps, that there might be a state governor who would tell him that this sort of commanding would only be appropriate in the walls of the Pentagon. In this case, however, the 'reinless' American secretary is urging to put things "in order" (naturally, in a way Washington would like to see it) not in an American state, but in a sovereign Arab country thousands of miles away from the United States, whose people have the inalienable right to decide their problems themselves, without any outside pressure. Is it not the most insolent and remorseless interference in other people's affairs?

Confirming and elaborating plans for American invasion of Lebanon, Mr Weinberger went as far as to say that Washington's goal was allegedly to try to return sovereignty to Lebanon and even to make that country's borders "safe". This shows how far hypocrisy and demagogy have carried the Pentagon chief. As if it were not the United States that has been acting as both a patronizer and a direct accomplice in the Israeli aggression. As if the world did not know that the Zionist interventionists have violated the Lebanese frontiers, mutilated the country by fire and sword and imposed a blockade on Beirut which is in flames under Israeli bombardments, only because Washington has been doing all it can to protect and encourage the aggressor, because it is lavishly supplying it with arms and is trying to protect Israel politically.

The chief of the Pentagon says in his interview, among other things, that although Washington considers the planned introduction of American troops into Lebanon as a "limited" action, these troops will stay there "as long as necessary." In other words, Mr Weinberger has virtually confirmed that this is not just going to be an occupation of a sovereign country, but a long occupation with the well-known aim: the practising of genocide, jointly with Israel, against the Arab people of Palestine, the splitting of Lebanon and the setting up of still another American bridgehead in an alien territory. This is the "sovereignty" and "security of borders," Washington style!

Ponomarev Analysis

LD121934 Moscow TASS in English 1914 GMT 12 Jul 82

["Weinberger Divulges His Plans" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 12 TASS -- TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

The United States is grossly interfering in Lebanon's internal affairs, working to install in power there a regime obedient to Washington. In an interview with the American NBC company on Sunday, the U.S. defence Secretary Weinberger said that the present government of Lebanon is allegedly "incapable" of controlling the situation in the country to the extent to which this must be done by the government of a sovereign country. In this connection, the USA is prepared "to do everything that "depends" on it so as to see the Lebanese Government regain its effectiveness. Weinberger said nothing, however, about the fact that it is precisely the policy pursued by the U.S. administration and the bandit actions of Tel Aviv that are the main reason for the unstable situation in Lebanon. What this policy represents in practice can be seen in the concrete actions of the USA and Israel in Lebanon.

The Israeli aggressors continue to shell the Lebanese capital literally at a pointblank range. Shells are already exploding on the roof of the presidential palace. At the same time the special emissary of the U.S. President, Habib, is engaged in behind-the-scenes negotiations in order to achieve an end to any resistance to the Israeli aggression and the American diktat. It was not fortuitous that at a meeting with newsmen last week Weinberger said directly that the USA strove to give Habib assistance in order to achieve a solution favouring Washington. This means that diplomatic steps must be complemented by military actions. It is these objectives that lie at the root of President Reagan's idea to send U.S. Marines to Lebanon. Its interventionist plans are camouflaged in hypocritical assurances that U.S. troops will allegedly stay in Lebanon "a mere several days" and that their sole mission would be to evacuate the PLO force from Lebanon.

By the word "to evacuate," American officials in effect mean interning the military and political forces of the Palestine Liberation Organization as if they were routed or surrendered, as well as, if possible, of all the Palestinian refugees. Yes, Washington has actually decided to intern the Arab people of Palestine whose country has been captured by Israeli aggressors. Israel, the "strategic partner" of the USA, does not stop short of open genocide in order to bring down on its knees all the Arab East and to attain its hegemonist aims. Today, Israel and the USA are directing the main blow at Lebanon and the forces of the Palestine resistance movement. Tomorrow they may fall on another victim. This is the practical meaning of the "Camp David process" -- this anti-Arab alliance of imperialism and Zionism. The duty of all honest people of the world is to disrupt the designs of this alliance.

VASILYEV: 'SITUATION REMAINS CRITICAL'

LD122058 Moscow TASS in English 2012 GMT 12 Jul 82

[Excerpts] Moscow July 12 TASS -- TASS commentator Grigoriy Vasilyev writes:

The situation remains critical in Lebanon. Having invaded the territory of that sovereign Arab state in blatant violation of international law, Israeli soldiery sows death and destruction on Lebanese soil, causing untold deprivations and suffering to Palestinian and Lebanese people. Thousands of peaceful civilians -- women, old people and children -- have been and are being killed.

Why do the Israelis continue to perpetrate outrages in Lebanon, to commit acts of banditry on Lebanese soil? There is only one answer. Because Israel is backed by the United States which has armed the aggressor to the teeth with up-to-date weapons and which at the same time supports it in every way politically and economically. The position of the United States naturally encourages Israeli bandits and prods them toward new sallies. Without a doubt, the United States shares full responsibility together with its "strategic ally," Israel, for the aggression against Lebanon. And no amount of hypocritical statements by high-ranking U.S. administration officials concerning the "protection of Lebanon's sovereignty" and the "striving for peace" in that country can conceal that.

Meanwhile the decisions of the United Nations Security Council which provide for a cease-fire and an immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon create a realistic basis for settling the crisis. The sooner these decisions are implemented, the sooner the bloodshed will stop in long-suffering Lebanon, the sooner prerequisites will be created for a really durable and lasting settlement of the explosive situation.

U.S., ISRAELI ROLE IN LEBANON CONDEMNED

U.S. Hypocrisy

LD101602 Moscow TASS in English 1520 GMT 10 Jul 82

["Washington's Hypocrisy and Cynicism" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 10 TASS -- TASS commentator Yevgeney Kiselev reports.

The Washington leaders often hold forth these days on the "peace-making" role of the U.S. in connection with the continuing bloodshed in Lebanon. Thus, Larry Speakes, representative of the White House, speaking on the intention of the United States to dispatch to Beirut a contingent of Marines, stated that all the U.S. steps, all the statements pursue only one goal, that of peace.

These bombastic, but absolutely false statements have nothing to do with reality. According to the U.S. press, that country unleashed armed conflicts, resorted to brute force or threatened to resort to it in various parts of the world, pursuing its aggressive, interventionist aims, 215 times in the post-war period. The U.S. leadership examined variants of using nuclear weapons 19 times during this time.

U.S. Marines first landed on the golden beaches of Lebanon to suppress the national liberation movement of Arabs in July 1958, following an order of President Eisenhower. U.S. Air Force bombed many objects on the territory of Cuba in April 1961, which was followed by an invasion of the "Liberty Island" by detachments of counterrevolutionaries trained and equipped by the U.S. Four years later, U.S. Marines perpetrated an armed intervention of the Dominican Republic and soon occupied Santo Domingo, the capital of that country.

American military destroyed rice fields and burnt peasants huts, having started an unprovoked aggression against neutral Cambodia in April 1970.

The dirty war of U.S. imperialism in Indochina lasted for 10 years. During this period more bombs and shells were dropped on peaceful civilians of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, than were used at all the fronts of the Second World War from 1939 to 1945.

African countries also fell victim to the U.S. armed brigandage. A joint U.S.-Belgian expeditionary force landed in Congo (Kinshasa) in November 1964, which resulted in the downfall of the Lumumba government.

These are just a few facts from the recent history of the U.S. imperialism, which serve as immutable indication of its aspiration to the role of a world gendarme and its attempts to establish control over various parts of the globe. Against this background demagogic statements of Washington officials about the "peace-making" role are regarded by peoples as sheer hypocrisy and cynicism.

'Ultimate Solution'

LD101940 Moscow TASS in English 1814 GMT 10 Jul 82

["Washington Is Accomplice in Crime" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 10 TASS -- TASS commentator Ruslan Knyazev writes: It is more than thirty days now that Israeli invaders have been committing excesses on Lebanese soil. The major cities of a sovereign country have been reduced to ruins, thousands upon thousands of civilians killed and wounded, and hundreds of thousands of people compelled to leave their home parts. But Tel Aviv rulers, supported by the entire powerful machinery of Washington's propaganda, are still telling the world that Israel's incursion into Lebanon is "an act of self-defence".

"The ultimate goal of our military action in Lebanon is to ensure the security of Israel's northern border," Israeli Defence Minister Sharon cynically told Austrian television in a statement which was nearly a replica of the stock propaganda which the Goebbels department used years ago to justify the "Third Reich's" aggressions. The Nazis once impudently imposed the regimes they had chosen on their neighbours. Sharon today follows suit by "expressing hope" for a new government in Lebanon which would conclude a capitulatory "peace treaty" with Israel.

Israeli interventionists, blessed by the Reagan administration, are now pushing efforts in Lebanon to physically destroy the Arab people of Palestine. After beseiging west Beirut, they have made everything to disrupt the city's supply with water, foodstuffs and electric energy.

Use has been made of pellet, phosphorous and napalm bombs, outlawed by international conventions, against women, children and old people. It is in this way that Israeli rulers are carrying out plans they coordinated with Washington for "the solution of the Palestinian issue."

The world has not forgotten how Hitlerite butchers 40 years ago acted to ensure an analogous "ultimate solution" with the help of massive banishments, killings, and death camps for millions of people, including Jews from a number of European countries.

Israeli propaganda has for many years exploited the memory of those who died at the hands of Hitlerite criminals. Tel Aviv made national heroes of people who had abducted fascist butcher Adolf Eichman and brought him to court.

Today, Begin and his associates have become loyal followers of that criminal, the Fuhrer's "main specialist" on "the ultimate solution", while the U.S. administration has shown complicity in Tel Aviv's crimes by directly aiding and abetting Israeli aggression against Lebanon.

'Mass Extermination'

LD092026 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1500 GMT 9 Jul 82

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] General Eytan, the Israeli Army's chief of General Staff, has officially admitted that an aggressive war is taking place in Lebanon. The fighting general said in a statement to the army weekly BAMAHANE that the battles in Lebanon are waged for greater Israel. Therefore, it is for this that the Zionists are killing Palestinian and Lebanese women, children and old people and are practising a policy of barbaric mass extermination against the two Arab peoples.

In his statement to the weekly BAMAHANE, General Eytan in fact stressed the existence of schemes by Tel Aviv to (?annex) the occupied Lebanese territories to Israel in one form or another.

Tel Aviv has not merely announced its expansionist schemes, the [word indistinct] are carrying out practical steps to colonize Lebanese territories. We shall briefly mention an example: The Israeli Government has ordered the preparation of winter clothes for the intervention forces in Lebanon, which number more than 100,000 soldiers and officers. They are therefore going to stay in Lebanon for a long time.

One wonders about what kind of retaliatory action by Israel in Lebanon the Washington hypocrites are talking about. Washington, by the way, is extending the scope of U.S. participation in the bloodshed in Lebanon. U.S. official circles share full responsibility with Israel for the criminal destructive acts in Lebanon and the destruction of the sovereign state of Lebanon.

PERFORMANCE OF SOVIET WEAPONS DEFENDED

LD111848 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1500 GMT 11 Jul 82

[Nikolay (Putko) commentary: "By Deed and Not By Word"]

[Text] The Israeli-U.S. aggression in Lebanon, which has been continuing for a while, has brought unlimited disaster and misfortune to this [word indistinct] country. Tens of thousands of Lebanese and Palestinians have been killed, hundreds of thousands have been made homeless and the towns of Damour, Tyre and Sidon have been completely destroyed. Extensive destruction has been inflicted on Beirut. However, the enemy has not escaped the (?squeeze). The aggressors have suffered substantial losses in battles with units of the Palestinian resistance movement, the Lebanese national forces and the Syrian forces within the Arab deterrent force.

From the ninth to the eleventh of last month in this war, which is the longest Arab-Israeli war, the Israelis lost 70 tanks and armoured vehicles and dozens of the most modern U.S.-made aircraft in the battles with the Syrians alone. For the first time, military observers have seen Arab pilots in Soviet planes engaged on an equal level in dogfights against Israeli pilots. In the opinion of military experts the presence of the Syrian Army's Soviet tanks has been felt and they have proved their superiority over Israeli U.S. M60 tanks in every way. The Arabs' successful use of other Soviet weapons has been pointed out.

This is not the first time Soviet weapons have proved their reliability and effectiveness. In the October 1973 war, Golda Meir, the prime minister of Israel at the time, explained the Israeli Army's colossal losses in an official press conference, attributing them to the superiority of the Arab armies' Soviet weapons. In this regard, statements in the Western press that Soviet weapons have been shown ineffective in recent Arab battles with the Israeli aggressors, who are armed with U.S. weapons, have attracted a great deal of attention.

Why are such lies being spread? The answer to this question is simple: Imperialism and Zionism have always exploited every opportunity to shake Arabs' trust in the Soviet Union, their sincere and firm ally in the struggle against imperialism, and do not hesitate to use any means to achieve this. Furthermore, in spreading rumors about the poor quality of Soviet weapons, Israel is carrying out a psychological war to destroy the morale of the Syrian troops and the combatants of the joint forces and [words indistinct].

Sheftunov Commentary

NC110734 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1630 GMT 9 Jul 82

[Igor Sheftunov commentary]

[Excerpts] U.S. imperialists and Israeli Zionists have attacked Lebanon in the fifth war in the Near East in the past 30 years. Their intention is physically to destroy the Palestinians and to turn Lebanon into a fiefdom. They intend to move closer to the occupation and usurpation of new territories in western Asia. As rightly put by Iranian Deputy Foreign Minister 'Azizi recently, the Israeli regime's strategy is to usurp and occupy Islamic territories [words indistinct].

Before the beginning of the war, imperialist and Zionist propaganda networks had started a long, vigorous campaign by which they wanted to assure Islamic nations that they are unable to resist the expectations and (?bullying) of the United States and Israel.

Washington is flagrantly proposing to Near and Middle East countries that they follow the example of As-Sadat, who surrendered to Israel. Together with this proposal, efforts are underway to mar the support which the Soviet Union and other anti-imperialist forces extend to Muslim nations which are trying to advance on the path of independent development.

It is very regrettable that some Iranian personalities and Tehran newspapers are also acting in the same way. For instance, the mentally deranged Jalaleddin Farsi, who after his trip last year to the Soviet Union turned into an expert in distributing and publishing anti-Soviet condemnations, tried in a speech to Tehran residents to underestimate the Soviet Union's military assistance to the Syrian Republic. ETTELA'AT newspaper published his remarks in bold type in a prominent place.

Imperialist and Zionist propaganda very willingly (?welcome) such anti-Soviet concoctions which pour oil on the fire of aggressors who have started a war against Lebanon.

The Soviet Union, which is faithful to its commitments, has extended effective assistance to the Syrian Republic with which it has signed a friendship and cooperation agreement. The modern arms given by our country to Syria allowed the latter to resist the aggressor. Discussing the effectiveness of Soviet assistance, the Syrian AL-BA'TH wrote: With the arms given to Syria by the Soviet Union, dozens of Israeli aircraft, including the most modern U.S.-manufactured aircraft, have been downed. Syrian soldiers destroyed a large number of Israeli tanks and other technical equipment by using Soviet-made missiles. AL-BA'TH newspaper wrote: The Syrian people and the country's political and military leaders fully understand the extent of the assistance extended by the Soviet Union in developing the Syrian Arab Republic's economy and in strengthening its armed forces. Do not allow anyone to doubt the friendly Soviet stance. AL-BA'TH stressed in conclusion: The Soviet Union's constant assistance, which did not end even during the recent developments in Lebanon, allowed Syria to stand next to the Palestinian and Lebanese people and to fight against imperialism, Zionism and reaction.

The U.S. administration, which is trying to achieve its imperialist objectives in the Near East, is assisting the Israeli aggressors in gaining a firm foothold in Lebanon and is attempting to get directly involved in this adventurism.

At a time when the crisis is intensifying in the Near East, the cooperation of all anti-imperialist forces gains special importance. In its extraordinary session held in Tripoli this week, the Arabs' general congress called on the Islamic Republic of Iran as well as all Muslim countries to close their ranks and to think of thorough steps in a joint struggle against imperialism and Zionism. The participants in this congress also emphasized the great importance of cooperating with the Soviet Union and announced that they are trying further to consolidate this cooperation.

What can be said about the Soviet Union's policy is that the Soviet Union has always persistently defended the ideals of those sacrificed because of the Israeli aggression. The warning issued by Leonid Brezhnev on the United States' aggressive policy in the Near East proves this point once again.

ARAB PARTIES ISSUE STATEMENT ON LEBANON

LD121420 Moscow TASS in English 1403 GMT 12 Jul 82

[Text] Damascus July 12 TASS -- A statement by representatives of the communist and workers' parties of the Arab east, adopted at an urgent meeting early in July, has been circulated here. Taking part in it were representatives of the Syrian, Lebanese, Jordanian, Iraqi, Palestinian and Egyptian communist parties, the National Liberation Front of Bahrain and the Communist Party of Saudi Arabia.

Israel's aggression against Lebanon is lasting for more than a month, the statement says. The Israeli invaders are sowing death and destruction in that much-suffering country. Their crimes are comparable only with the atrocities of the German-fascist hordes during the Second World War. Having become the target of a barbaric war of annihilation the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples, the Syrian fightingmen are staunchly enduring the hardships and heroically repulsing the interventionists.

Lebanon is being subjected to total seizure planned and prepared with the direct participation of the American administration. The division of roles in the solution of the military and political tasks of the intervention is carried out in accordance with the American-Israeli agreement on "strategic cooperation" and accords reached in the course of consultations between Tel Aviv and Washington on the eve of the aggression.

Israel and the United States are trying to suppress the Palestine resistance movement, the Lebanese national-patriotic forces and Syria and thereby remove the main obstacle standing in the way of the imposition of the Camp David scenario on the Middle East. The coincidence of the oil and military-strategic interests of the United States with the expansionist ambitions of Israel explains the identity of the aims pursued by the participants in the anti-Arab alliance in Lebanon: annihilation of the Palestinian people, weakening of Syria, striking a blow at the national-patriotic forces and partitioning of Lebanon.

The communist and workers' parties of the Arab east resolutely condemn the position of the isolationist forces in Lebanon, first of all the Kata'ib Party which, starting with 1975, has repeatedly rendered services to Israel and American imperialism.

By supporting Israel's aggression Washington strives to reverse political development in that region in its own interests, to strengthen its own positions and the positions of the local reaction, to draw the Arab countries into aggressive blocs, to weaken the regimes opposing the imperialist course.

The position of silence in respect of the tragic events in Lebanon by reactionary Arab regimes deserves condemnation in this connection. Betraying the national cause of the Arabs they refuse to use the means at their disposal in the interests of the struggle that is being conducted single-handedly against the enemy by the Palestinian resistance movement, the national-patriotic forces of Lebanon and Syria.

This position is not a tactical error but a natural result of pro-imperialist policy.

The aggression is continuing, the danger overhanging Beirut is growing and increasing is the danger of direct American interference in the conflict, the statement says further. A special danger is posed by the possible landing of American troops in Lebanon, mentioned by the White House. All Arab patriots should direct their efforts at preventing this.

The statement praises the international support given to the defenders of Lebanon. The main role in this, the document notes, is played by socialist countries and first of all the true friend of the Arabs - the Soviet Union. The fraternal communist parties, the democratic and peaceloving forces of various countries of the world, the non-aligned states are also making their contribution to the isolation of Israel and its American patrons.

The communist and workers' parties of the Arab east are fully aware of the immense importance of international aid and solidarity with the struggle against the Israeli intervention. As before, they will strengthen bonds of friendship and cooperation with the great Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community, with all detachments of the revolutionary anti-imperialist movement.

The document calls on the working class of Arab countries to adopt concrete measures to frustrate the criminal American-Israeli plot against Lebanon and to put an end to the aggression.

In conclusion the parties that signed the joint document proclaimed: "Hands off Lebanon", "May strengthen the militant alliance of the Palestine resistance movement, the Lebanese national-patriotic forces and Syria", "May Arab-Soviet friendship live and develop."

NATIONWIDE PROTESTS AGAINST ISRAELI AGGRESSION

LD111058 Moscow TASS in English 1030 GMT 11 Jul 82

["Fascism Will Not Pass!" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 11 TASS -- It is with profound concern that the Soviet people are watching the tragic developments in the Middle East. Meetings of protest against the Israeli aggression are being held nation-wide.

The workers of Moscow's Artificial Leather Production Association came together for their rally at a monument to the workers of the mill, who were killed in the years of the Second World War. The very choice of the place for the rally has determined the character of the attitude of people to the Israeli invasion of Lebanon.

The speakers said that there will be no pardon for the Zionist aggressors and their overseas patrons. The Soviet people, who went through the horrors of the Nazi invasion, cannot put up with the revival of facism. And no other word can be used to describe what the Israeli occupiers do. Workers unanimously approved of Leonid Brezhnev's appeal to the President of the United States.

The participants in the rallies in Tadzhikistan describe the Israeli aggression against Lebanon as bloody adventurism. Veteran worker Petr Yevtin, said addressing a rally at a transformer works in Kurgan-Tyube: "Acting under the hypocritical pretext of combatting terrorism, the imperialists and Zionists are out to deal a blow to the Arab national liberation forces, to deprive the Palestinian people of its combat vanguard. But neither political adventurism, nor the weapons presented to the aggressor by the Pentagon, including such barbaric weapons as plastic and phosphorous bombs, toxic agents, will be able to break the will of the Lebanese and Palestinians to freedom and independence. We, Soviet people, are on the side of the Lebanese and the Palestinians."

The participants in mammoth meetings of protest, which are being held in the Smolensk region (central Russia) unanimously demand an end to the killing of the peaceful Lebanese people. Nobody has the right to force its conditions on other people. We condemn the actions of the U.S. administration, which encourages the criminal acts of the aggressors.

Addressing the rallies, the working people ardently approve of Leonid Brezhnev's address to the President of the United States.

Solidarity With Palestinians

LD101022 Moscow TASS in English 1000 GMT 10 Jul 82

["Firm Support to the Arab People of Palestine" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 10 TASS -- The Soviet public's fraternal solidarity with and firm support to the Arab people of Palestine, which Israel now is trying to exterminate in a war of annihilation, has been reiterated in a meeting between leaders of the Union of Soviet Society for Friendship with Foreign Countries and the Soviet Committee of Friendship and Solidarity with the Arab People of Palestine and Mahmud 'Abbas, president of the Palestinian-Soviet Friendship Society and member of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Mahmud 'Abbas spoke highly of the USSR's assistance and support to the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples in repelling Israel's barbarous aggression in Lebanon and restated the Palestinian patriots' determination to continue fighting under the PLO's leadership to ensure their legitimate rights.

The Middle East policy of the United States, on whose instructions and by using whose all-round aid Israel has staged a bloody massacre in Lebanon was strongly denounced during the meeting.

MEDICAL AID, SUPPLIES TO BE SENT TO BEIRUT

PM120911 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jul 82 p 4

[TASS report: "Humane Act"]

[Text] The Union of Societies of the Red Cross and the Red Crescent of the USSR and the Soviet Peace Foundation, guided by the principles of humanism and international solidarity, are dispatching by Aeroflot aircraft within the next few days medical supplies, blankets, tents and children's food for the population of Lebanon. Wounded Lebanese and Palestinians will be brought to the USSR for treatment.

UN DELEGATE COMMENTS ON IRAN-IRAQ CONFLICT

LD130910 Moscow TASS in English 0818 GMT 13 Jul 82

[Text] New York July 13 TASS (TASS correspondent Ye. Menkes) -- The U.N. Security Council has reviewed the situation in relations between Iran and Iraq.

The resolution unanimously approved by the council urges the immediate termination of all combat operations and also the withdrawal of all the armed forces within internationally recognized borders. The document suggests that all the other states refrain from any actions which may contribute towards the contamination of the conflict, and also facilitate the implementation of the resolution.

The Security Council voiced its deep worry over the continued conflict between the two countries, resulting in grave losses of human life and considerable damage to property and posing a threat to peace and security, and spoke in favour of the continued mediating efforts of the U.N. secretary general with a view to achieving a comprehensive and just settlement of all the disputable issues on the basis of the principles of the U.N. Charter that would be acceptable to both sides.

The worry and concern of the overwhelming majority of the U.N. members over the continued armed conflict between Iran and Iraq are wholeheartedly shared by the Soviet Union, Oleg Troyanovskiy, the Soviet Union's permanent representative to the United Nations, said. The USSR cannot but have an interest in removing the dangerous centres of tension in the areas lying in close proximity of its borders and also in all the other points of the globe.

Stressing the need for the earliest possible termination of combat operations between Iran and Iraq and the settlement of disputable issues through talks, the Soviet representative pointed out that the continuation of the conflict, which is tragically senseless, distracts the attention of the leaders and peoples of those countries from the solution of pressing problems of economic and social development and from the tasks of struggle against Israel's continuous aggression and the plans hatched by the imperialist circles for establishing their domination of that region.

The Soviet Union, he stressed, has resolutely come out against the attempts of the imperialist forces to cash in on the Iranian-Iraqi conflict and to use it to enhance their own military and political infiltration of the Near and Middle East and the further destabilization of the situation in the region.

JOINT IRRIGATION PROJECTS WITH IRAN EXPANDING

NC102301 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 10 Jul 82

[Unattributed talk]

[Text] The commissioning of the hydroelectrical and technical installations on the Aras River border marks its 11th anniversary.

Our economic analyst writes: This marked the beginning of an important phase in the expansion of Soviet-Iranian economic relations based on the principle of equal rights and mutual benefits in exploiting the water and energy resources of rivers flowing along the Soviet-Iranian border.

The Aras hydroelectrical and technical installations consist of an earthen dam with an approximate length of 1 km and two hydroelectric generators with equal output -- one on the Iranian bank and the other on the Soviet bank of the Aras River.

In addition, the Mil-o Moghan reservoir dam was constructed a short distance away for irrigating the surrounding areas. Following the construction of the Aras River hydroelectrical and technical center, the flow of the Aras River, which previously emptied into the Caspian Sea, is now more effectively regulated. This water is now used to irrigate the two countries' farms and for the production of cheap electricity. By using the waters of the river basin built by Soviet-Iranian workers and experts, farmers have irrigated about 70,000 hectares of the arid fields of Mil-o Moghan and various agricultural products are now being cultivated on the irrigated lands.

Soviet-Iranian cooperation in using the waters of border rivers -- a cooperation based on the principle of equal rights and mutual benefits -- is successfully increasing. Plans call for the installation of two hydroelectrical and technical centers similar to the Aras installations in Khoda Afarin and Qez Qal'eh, which are 200 kilometers from the Aras installations. Soviet organizations have drafted the technical blueprints for these two centers and the construction of the Khoda Afarin hydroelectrical and technical center is scheduled to begin in the near future.

Our two countries's cooperation, based on the principle of equal rights and mutual benefits, in using the water reserves of border rivers leads to the consolidation of the economic independence of the Islamic Republic of Iran and to the further expansion of goodneighborly relations between the Soviet Union and Iran.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA ATTACKS WESTERN POLICY IN NAMIBIA

PM091341 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Jul 82 p 3

[Yu. Kirpichnikov article: "Maneuvers Over Namibia"]

[Text] A severe drought has been raging for several years now. A hot wind blows over the cracked red earth, filling the parched river channels with sand and scorching the remains of the stunted vegetation. This is how the greater part of Namibia looks now -- a region which quite recently the Bushmen, the indigenous inhabitants of these areas, nicknamed "the land created by God in a rage."

In their way, the South African occupiers have supplemented the grim local landscape, "adding" to it the black ashes of razed villages, hornets' nests of military bases and sinister outlines of machinegun towers. They are placing a thick barricade around the cities, mines and large farms, especially in the northern regions which the South African military call the "operational zone." But Pretoria cannot localize the flames of the liberation struggle to the limits of this zone. They are burning all the way from the Orange River separating Namibia from the apartheid state to the Cunene River on the border with Angola. Just recently, the People's Liberation Army of Namibia carried out daring operations on the Tsumeb mining settlement and attacked a number of South African bases with missiles and mines, wiping out a considerable amount of manpower and equipment. Great commotion was caused among the racists by the blowing up of the railway line 2.5 kms from the station at Windhoek, the country's administrative center.

This is understandable. After all, the main railway line -- the only one between South Africa and Namibia -- is of tremendous significance for the racists. Trains carrying new punitive troop units and ammunition and military hardware made in the United States, the FRG, Israel and Britain travel north along it continuously. Plundered natural riches are exported along the same line. Despite firm protests by the United Nations, which as long ago as 1966 stripped South Africa of the right to administer Namibia as a trust territory, dozens of multinationals, defended by racist bayonets, are extracting uranium, diamonds, lead and rare metals from the country's soil.

But from the viewpoint of Pretoria and its allies, Namibia's value is not limited to its unique collection of mineral resources in which the Western powers' military-industrial corporations are very interested. In effect, this South African colony represents a vast buffer zone on the approaches to the last bastion of colonialism on the continent and a convenient bridgehead for organizing subversive actions against Angola, Zambia, Zimbabwe and other "frontline states," especially since, as Mozambique President Samora Machel has stated, Pretoria's aggressive course is no different from the policy of Zionist Israel, which has launched aggression against sovereign Lebanon and is committing barbarous reprisals against the civilian population there. The liberation movement's victory in Namibia would undoubtedly be a serious blow to the apartheid regime, which in turn would entail a general weakening of imperialism's economic, political and strategic positions in southern Africa. Such a prospect does not suit the United States and its allies at all. It is this factor which exposes the real state of affairs of the continuing dirty game over Namibia undertaken by the West and the criminal racist regime.

It is hard to calculate the number of times the so-called "contact group," created on Washington's initiative from representatives of the Western powers as far back as 1977, has met with the South African ruling elite. As is well known, of its own accord it undertook to mediate between the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and South Africa. What results have been achieved by the representatives of the United States and the other NATO countries belonging to the "contact group"? "Much effort for little reward," as they say. In the words of former UN Commissioner for Namibia MacBride, "5 years' delay" has not only failed to move forward the solution of one of the acutest African problems by a single step but, on the contrary, has considerably worsened it.

The "five" are clearly prolonging the talks to prevent the application of sanctions against South Africa, give the racists time to eliminate the patriotic forces in Namibia, remove the examination of the Namibian problem from the UN framework and force SWAPO to accept Pretoria's terms; which would deprive the patriots of their legitimate right to administer the country. As the ETHIOPIAN HERALD has pointed out in this connection, the "main design of Western policy is to weaken SWAPO's position and strengthen the neocolonialist puppet regime in Namibia."

And Pretoria has not failed to take advantage of the respite. The racists have intensively built up their forces in Namibia in an effort to use them to rout SWAPO and thereby clear the way toward the proclamation of Namibian "pseudoindependence."

The racist ringleaders' impudence can be explained primarily by their confidence in unconditional Western support, above all from the United States. Washington has, in fact, always maintained close ties with Pretoria but nevertheless has preferred not to demonstrate them in such an overtly cynical form as the present Washington administration is doing. Soon after his arrival in the White House, Reagan called South Africa a "friendly country and military ally." The statements have been followed up by concrete steps. At a session of the subcommittee on African affairs, C. Crocker, U.S. assistant secretary of state for African affairs, set out a broad program of measures for expanding cooperation with South Africa. And Lt Commander R. Keplinger, naval attache at the U.S. Embassy in South Africa, who arrived in Pretoria at the beginning of this year, stated bluntly when opening the military legation that the U.S. and South African Navies are planning joint combat operations to secure the "West's strategic interests" in Africa, the Indian Ocean and the South Atlantic. In the opinion of foreign observers, the establishment of a U.S. military legation in Pretoria is designed to promote a closer coordination of actions between the two countries' armed forces. The use of South African strategic installations by the U.S. "Rapid Deployment Forces" is also in question. The U.S. Navy is interested in using bases at Simonstown, Durban and the Namibian port of Walvis Bay, annexed by the racists.

The rapprochement between the United States and South Africa, particularly in the military sphere, gives a dangerous new aspect to the Namibian problem. There is increasing evidence that Washington and Pretoria intend to step up their interference in southern Africa. The shadow of racist aggression hangs constantly over the "Frontline States." The United States is stepping up support for the gangs of J. Savimbi, ringleader of the anti-Angolan National Union for the Total Independence of Angola, who is maintained by the U.S. CIA and the South African secret services. In light of these facts, there can hardly be any doubt that the facist military's acts of armed incursion into Angola are being committed, if not on Washington's direct instructions, then with its tacit approval. The aim of these bandit sallies is clear: to create a buffer zone in southern Angola in which Savimbi could be consolidated and force the Angolan Government, under threat of the destabilization of the situation in the country, to abandon its support for the Namibian patriots.

Thus the United States, together with Pretoria, bears the main responsibility for the South African racists' continuing illegal occupation of Namibia and the South African military's escalation of terror and repression against the Namibian and other African peoples. But as history shows, even the mightiest military machine cannot break the peoples' will for freedom and independence.

S. AFRICAN 'ATROCITIES' IN NAMIBIA REPORTED

LD130458 Moscow TASS in English 0446 GMT 13 Jul 82

[Text] Harare July 13 TASS -- When women from Ruakan in northern Namibia set out together with their children for the neighbouring village, nothing indicated they would meet their death on the road. They have been ambushed, cold-bloodedly shot to death by a South African Army patrol to whom the area is a zone of combat operations.

The criminals guilty of this premediated murder got away with it. True, an army tribunal examined this case as a decoy, but charges against them were dropped under the pretext that they had taken women and children for "guerrillas."

Such atrocities are commonplace in Namibia, illegally occupied by the racist-ruled Republic of South Africa. Under the pretext of combatting the detachments of patriots of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), occupation troops raid villages murdering everybody in sight. Africans aptly dubbed them "vultures."

Pretoria cut-throats pillage, destroy crops and livestock, beat and torture local populations. A certain D. Van der Heever, formerly a corporal with the South African Regular Army who asked for political asylum in Zimbabwe, said that occupation troops in Namibia had unlimited powers and could stage "acts of intimidation" even without consulting their command.

SOMALI LEADERS TURN AWAY FROM SOCIALIST CAMP

LD102108 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 10 Jul 82

[Text] The Somali Revolutionary Socialist Party was set up 6 yeras ago; a comment now about some slogans and deeds of the party from our observer Georgiy Tanov. This is what he writes:

The establishment of the party was regarded in Somalia and outside it as an important progressive step. The party pledged allegiance to the ideas of scientific socialism, and saw its main task in meeting to the maximum the needs and interests of the working people. The leading role of the working class was stressed among other things. But very soon, especially during and after the Somali aggression against Ethiopia, the interests of the working people was sacrificed for a chauvinistic expansionist course by the Somali leaders. The principles of democratic centralism, fixed down in the party's documents, and characteristic of any progressive organization, were replaced with relations of tribalistic solidarity, nepotism and local strife, although the need to overcome these leftovers from colonialism was stressed both in the program of the Somali Revolutionary Socialist Party and in the country's constitution.

The composition of the party's activists and Central Committee has changed considerably, despite the brief existence of the party. Many party leaders have been replaced, some have been arrested, and others have been forced to emigrate. (?Apparently), the party's crisis and the crisis of the Somali domestic and foreign policy are due to the expansionist, pro-Western line of the country's leaders. It has now been established that back during preparations for the creation of the Somali Revolutionary Socialist Party, and during the first few months of the party's existence, the Siad Barre regime was secretly considering aggression against Ethiopia and other neighboring states. Following the failure of the aggression, support was openly declared at the party's emergency congress in January 1979 for the separatist forces of the so-called Western Somali Liberation Front.

Inconsistence of the ruling party elite can be well traced in the elite's attitude to the socialist countries, especially to the Soviet Union. When Siad Barre was making a report at the constituent congress of the Somali Revolutionary Socialist Party, he stressed -- and I quote -- that a primary foreign policy objective of the party is to maintain and strengthen friendly relations with the socialist states, which have always been giving and are still giving assistance to the Somali people. Similar statements were made again and again, including by high-ranking delegations that came to Moscow for the celebration of the 60th anniversary of the socialist revolution in Russia. Several days later the Mogadishu regime unilaterally abrogated the Soviet-Somali treaty of friendship and cooperation. Since then, certain quarters of Somalia have been doing their best to erase from the memory of the people the years of Soviet-Somali cooperation. The events of the past few months show that inside and outside the Somali Revolutionary Socialist Party, there is a growing conviction that the ruling elite is wrong in following a militaristic, pro-American course, which as brought the country to international isolation, and has placed it on the brink of economic disaster.

GREEN BERET INVOLVEMENT IN EL SALVADOR CITED

PY130244 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Spanish to Latin America 0130 GMT 10 Jul 82

[Text] The United States has decided to increase the number of its military personnel in El Salvador. Reliable sources in Washington have reported that this step will be carried out by sending new contingents of special troops and agents to El Salvador, which is currently shaken by a civil war. This viewpoint is based on the fact the number of military advisers in El Salvador is not quite enough: There are advisers in almost every unit of the Salvadoran Army.

However, in view of the defeat of government troops, the United States is increasingly making use of its own troops and Honduran troops as well as mercenaries from other countries.

The Yankees have repeatedly used such tactics in several regions of the world. In this regard, the statement made by former Green Beret Luke Thompson, published by the New York TIMES, is quite illustrative.

Thompson, a veteran of U.S. banditry around the world, was enrolled in the special forces for 16 years. From 1972 [as heard] on, he took part in the Yankee aggression against Indochina and in some actions in other Asian and Latin American countries. He said to the New York TIMES: For us, killing someone was like brushing our teeth after eating. We killed political leaders, governors, businessmen: all of those who, according to what we were told, were supporters of revolutionary or nationalistic forces. When he referred to Latin America, Thompson admitted that he and other Green Berets participated in the murder of Col Francisco Caamano Deno, the chief of Dominican Constitutionalists. In 1967, Thompson and his friends from the military bases located in the Panama Canal Zone were sent to Bolivia to chase Ernesto Che Guevara's detachment.

During his interview, the former Green Beret naturally made reference to events everybody is familiar with. He inadvertently revealed the mercenaries' antihuman philosophy and the complete disdain and hate for all blacks who dare have their own opinion, defend their human dignity and their country's sovereignty.

However, Thompson said nothing about the main issue: The international terrorism in which he was engaged for 16 years was carried out -- and is still being carried out -- following orders from the United States. Arms, money and the cult of the Green Berets do not come from nowhere: The U.S. military-industrial complex and other multinational companies interested in subduing and exploiting peoples are behind them.

New U.S. Green Beret detachments are arriving in El Salvador now. In this country, more than 40,000 peaceful people have already been massacred. U.S. Green Berets participated actively in the slaughters at the Sumpul River, in the town of Mozote, in the La Perla area and in other places where mass executions occurred. Green Berets are now heading for El Salvador to put into practice the sinister Centaur plan, designed by Pentagon and CIA advisers. This plan forsees the killing of 300,000 Salvadorans in an attempt to calm down the country for the sake of 14 oligarchic families and foreign imperialism.

GUYANA LEADER DECRIES 'IMPERIALIST INTERFERENCE'

LD121328 Moscow TASS in English 1301 GMT 12 Jul 82

[Text] Georgetown July 12 TASS -- Correspondent Aleksandr Kanishchev reports:

President Forbes Burnham of Guyana has sharply criticised imperialist interference in the affairs of developing countries. In his speech in Georgetown the president strongly condemned the attempts by some Western diplomatic missions to influence the home and foreign policy of Guyana and other developing states advancing along the road of socialist orientation.

Characterising the activities of these diplomatic missions as "insulting interference" in the internal affairs of developing states, Forbes Burnham noted that Guyana had no intention of changing its home and foreign policy and stated the striving of the Government of Guyana to keep to an independent road of development.

Analysing Burnham's speech, local political observers link it with the activities of the U.S. Embassy in Guyana. They note in this context that it is the United States that is now putting financial, economic and diplomatic pressure on Guyana with the aim of forcing it off its chosen road and it is representatives of the American diplomatic mission who are trying to influence the process of the forming of the country's political and economic course. President Burnham alluded to this in his speech.

'U.S.-BACKED' C. AMERICAN ORGANIZATION CONDEMNED

LD121522 Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 12 Jul 82

[Text] The establishment of a so-called Central American Democratic Community has been announced in San Salvador. Its members are El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala and Costa Rica. The community, our commentator Leonid Levchenko says, calls itself a democratic organization, but what has an organization got to do with democracy if it unites such reactionary regimes as those of El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras? The community is in fact another military-political bloc and its democratic sign serves as a cover for an association set up to consolidate regimes of tyranny and suppress the liberation movement.

In a declaration on the establishment of the community signed by the foreign ministers of El Salvador, Honduras and Costa Rica, its members tried to put the blame for the tension in the region on Nicaragua, and in general there are all indications that it is the revolutionary government of that country that participants in the new military-political group have chosen to be the main target of their subversive activity. Already now there are bands on Honduran territory formed of supporters of the deposed Nicaraguan dictator Somoza. From their camps in Honduras the bandits penetrate into Nicaragua to stage subversion and murder civilians, and from now on anti-Nicaraguan activities are to be coordinated by the newly-born bloc. Although the new community calls itself a Central American organization the nature of its activity is determined by official Washington which has in fact suggested the idea of setting up a new pact in Central America. The U.S. administration has stepped up efforts to unite the reactionary regimes by promising them financial and military aid. It is increasing military shipments to El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras.. More and more American advisers arrived there to lead punitive operations.

The United States has sent about 100 military advisers and 20 helicopters to Honduras over the past few days. The reactionary and aggressive nature of the Central American community has been exposed by the deputy foreign minister of Nicaragua, Victor Tinoco. The community, he said, is Washington's baby and meant to isolate Nicaragua. The Communist Party of Honduras has connected the formation of the military-political alliance with the U.S. policy of suppressing the national liberation movement in the region. President Royo of Panama has firmly rejected the establishment of the community.

Now that the community has come into being, the National Liberation Front of El Salvador says, we can expect the dispatch of U.S. troops to that country and simultaneously aggression against Nicaragua, occupation of Honduras and a move by Washington to convert Honduras into a springboard for establishing U.S. control throughout Central America and for subsequent aggressive actions against Cuba and Grenada.

U.S. PLANS FOR ANTI-CUBA PROPAGANDA CRITICIZED

PM091057 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Jul 82 Morning Edition p 4

[Article under the rubric "Ironical Notes": "After the Classic Pattern"; from "The World Today" feature compiled by Yu. Gatselyuk]

[Text] One of the classic writers of literature once voiced the opinion that politeness costs us little but is valued most highly by those around us. Of course, not everyone follows the rules of politeness, and everyone has his own classic patterns....

Hearings have taken place in the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee during which there was a discussion of questions of anti-Cuban propaganda with the help of the new radio station being set up after the pattern of the unfortunately well-known Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. The U.S. administration has already asked Congress for $17 million to finance the propaganda center in the current and next fiscal years. It is also proposed to utilize certain "private funds," which will most likely be supplemented by the counter-revolutionary rabble entrenched in the United States.

The hearings were attended by F. Ikle, U.S. under secretary of defense, as a "pusher" for the White House and the Pentagon. Attempting to put pressure on the senators according to the "classic" canons of imperialist rhetroic, Ikle emphasized in his speech that it will cost comparatively little to set up the new radio station, but in return, he prophesied, the United States will obtain a "powerful instrument" which, he said, will be an "effective measure to ensure U.S. national security"?!.

Fortunately, there are still sober people even in the U.S. Senate who realize that the practice of international relations must be built on other principles. The committee adopted a decision not to meet the White House request and to postpone discussion of this issue. It would be a good thing, however, for the White House to realize at last the wholly unrealistic nature of the policy of confrontation and reviving the "big stick" policy in international relations. For in this sphere, too, elementary politeness is capable of yielding far more dividends without undermining the national budget at the same time.

CRISIS SEEN IN RIO DE JANEIRO PACT, OAS

PY122222 Moscow in Portuguese to Brazil 2200 GMT 1 Jul 82

[By Valentin Selivanov]

[Text] Venezuela has refused to take part in the Unitas inter-American naval maneuvers. As is known, those maneuvers have been staged annually since 1960. Latin American observers regard Venezuela's attitude as a sign of the deterioration of relations between the United States and Latin American countries and of a crisis in the inter-American political-military system.

We remind our listeners that the inter-American political-military system was created by Washington during the first years after World War II. It was born in the middle of anti-Soviet military hysteria.

The Rio de Janeiro Treaty, signed in 1947, was the basis of the system. The treaty enabled Washington to carry out military intervention in Latin America.

Both military treaties granting different rights to signatory countries, signed by the United States and the Latin American countries, and the supply of U.S. arms to those countries were agreed upon within the inter-American political-military system and under the Rio de Janeiro pact.

Special U.S. military missions were sent to Latin America. Latin American officers were trained in U.S. military schools and joint maneuvers were staged regularly under the command of U.S. generals and admirals. All of this was done in an effort to achieve military control over Latin American armed forces.

U.S. imperialism made full use of the possibilities granted by the inter-American political-military system. Wherever the interests of U.S. monopolies might be threatened, armed interventions were effected either directly by the United States or by the so-called inter-American forces. This was the case in 1965 when inter-American forces, 90 percent of which was made up of U.S. soldiers, smashed the anti-imperialist revolution in Santo Domingo.

In 1964, U.S. military leaders created in Central America the so-called Central American Defense Council, Condeca. For 15 years, this council, made up of the Guatemalan, Honduran, Nicaraguan and Salvadoran armies, obediently fulfilled the Pentagon's orders. When the agony of U.S. front man Somoza started in Nicaragua under the pressure of the people's revolution, Condeca's armies could not act openly to save him. This event marked the beginning of the end of the U.S. aggressive military mechanism in Central America.

During the Malvinas Falkland Islands conflict, Latin Americans became convinced that the United States uses the Rio de Janeiro pact and the OAS only to its own advantage, in disregard of Latin American interests.

The British-Argentine conflict has caused an unprecedented aggravation of inter-American political-military relations. The most outstanding evidence of the crisis has been seen through the statements made by several Latin American military leaders against the Rio de Janeiro Treaty.

For example, Peruvian Army Chief of Staff Lt Gen Hernan Boluarte demanded the immediate revision of the inter-American Reciprocal Assistance Treaty, TIAR.

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS FOR 10-12 JUL REPORTED

LD130318 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 10-12 July. Times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

10 July

Mass wheat harvesting began in Moldavia today. The 660 complex detachments created in the republic are to harvest the crop in a short period of time. Because of the dry spring, cereal crops have grown stunted with small ears; however, the grain crops are big and of full weight. This was helped by the rains which fell during ripening. Combine drivers are being changed every 3 to 4 hours. (1000 GMT)

Bryanskaya Oblast has healthy looking early potato fields which are developing normally and are being carefully tended. Spraying is being carried out to combat Phytophthora and Colorado beetle. The potato crop on some fields in the western section of the oblast was hit by a sudden frost. Some fields had to be replanted. (1000 GMT)

In order to increase fodder stocks, growers in Krasnodarskiy Kray have started mass sowing of corn on areas where cereal crops have already been harvested. The farms are to carry out secondary sowing on an area of 400,000 hectares. (1300 GMT)

The harvest in the southern section of Nikolayevskaya Oblast is late this year. The weather has been cold and damp on the shores of the Black Sea; therefore, spring grain crops are undersized. On the other hand, this year's winter wheat crop promises to provide a really good yield. Harvest work is currently underway in the southern half of Nikolayevskaya Oblast. Great efforts are being made to prevent any wastage or loss of grain during the harvesting. (1500 GMT)

Grain has been gathered from 500,000 hectares in Kazakhstan. Cereals have already been harvested in the southern areas of Chimkentskaya Obalst and are being sold to the state. Grain from the new harvest is reaching the grain elevators in Dzhambulskaya, Alma-Atinskaya and Taldy-Kurganskaya Oblasts. (1500 GMT)

11 July

Public inspection of the state of preparation for the harvest is underwary in Chuvashskaya ASSR. The autonomous republic's grain production will exceed 1 million tons. Those carrying out the inspection are checking machines and reception points. Over 7,000 combine harvesters will participate in the harvest. (1500 GMT)

12 July

Kemerovoskaya Oblast has begun haymaking. (0001 GMT)

To date, farmers in Udmurtskaya ASSR have procured 500,000 tons of succulent and coarse fodder, vitamized grass veal and granules. (0400 GMT)

Despite frequent rain, Brestskaya Oblast machine operators have completed the first cutting of grasses. (0400 GMT)

The second alfalfa cutting has begun in southern Saratovaskaya Oblast. A total of 400,000 hectares of sown and natural grasses have been mown to date. (0600 GMT)

Tens of thousands of tons of the new grain harvest have been delivered to grain reception points in Krasnodarskiy Kray. Crimean farmers have completed threshing barley and are now conducting windrow harvesting of wheat. Laying in of fodder for livestock continues. (0800 GMT)

Barley threshing is nearly over in the Crimea. Harvesting of winter wheat is beginning in some areas, despite much recent rain. Four thousand combines are working throughout the oblast. (0805 GMT)

The grain harvest is in progress in Moldavia, in many oblasts of the southern Ukraine and in the Transcarpathian area. Grain is increasingly ripening toward northern Rostovskaya Oblast. Almost all of the harvesting and transport complexes have begun harvesting grain in the North Caucasus area. The harvesting units are leaving the fields of Central Asia. Grain threshing is basically complete in the plains and steppes, while the harvest is continuing in the hilly areas where grain ripens later. (1500 GMT)

The Dnepropetrovskaya Oblast combine plant has begun production of modernized beetloaders, which not only load beets into vehicles but also thoroughly cleanse them of dirt. This year 1,500 such powerful self-propelled units will be delivered to farms in the Ukraine, Krasnodarskiy Kray and the Non-Chernozem Zone. (1500 GMT)

Inspection of motor transportation for the transportation of the harvest has been completed in Tatarskaya ASSR; 22,000 trucks and truck trailers have been prepared. This is significantly more than last year. (1750 GMT)

RSFSR KOLKHOZ COUNCIL DEBATES FOOD PROGRAM

PM130837 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 2 Jul 82 p 2

[TASS report: "Tasks of RSFSR Kolkhozes"]

[Text] The tasks facing the republic's kolkhozes following the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) plenum decisions and the report delviered at the plenum by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, were discussed at a session of the All-Russian Kolkhoz Council held in Moscow on 1 July.

Keynote speaker L.Ya. Florentyev, chairman of the All-Russian Kolkhoz Council and RSFSR minister of agriculture, and others pointed out that the Food Program rests on the concrete foundation of the achievements of the sector's working people. Measures taken by the party and agricultural workers' unstinting labor have made it possible, despite unfavorable weather in recent years, to increase the average annual gross agricultural production on kolkhozes by more than 50 percent.

At the same time, however, there are still places where increased capital investment and a substantial consolidation of kolkhozes' material base is not accompanied by the requisite increase in production.

Specific measures for remedying the shortcomings were outlined at the council session.

Taking part in the session's work were: I.K. Kapustyan, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Agriculture Department and L.B. Yermin, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

BRIEFS

BUKHARA AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION -- Bukhara Oblast's agricultural workers held a meeting yesterday. They have pledged to produce, in commemoration of the 60th anniversary of the formation of the USSR, 500,000 tons of cotton, 151,000 tons of grain, 65,000 tons of vegetables and many other agricultural and livestock products. [Tashkent Domestic Service in Russian 0030 GMT 11 Jul 82 GF]